

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR MAY, 1822.

Art. I. *An Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination.* In four Discourses preached before the University of Oxford. With Notes and an Appendix on the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England. By Edward Copleston, D.D. Provost of Oriel College, and Prebendary of Rochester. Second Edition. 8vo. pp xvi, 220. Price 7s. 6d. London. 1821.

WE opened this volume with expectations more highly raised than, considering the nature of the subject to which it relates, were perhaps reasonable. The talents and acquirements of the Author prepared us to expect, if not any arguments or illustrations absolutely new on a subject that has for ages employed the utmost efforts of the human mind, at least a correct exposition of the present state of the controversy, and a competent display of logical and theological skill. Dr. Copleston has the credit of being one of the most accomplished scholars, and he is certainly one of the most elegant writers of the age. This high character he fully sustains in the present volume. In some parts of it, especially in the fourth discourse, he writes like a man of enlightened and sincere piety, and as such we unfeignedly honour him. But we must confess that we have been much disappointed in him as a divine. He is neither so formidable an antagonist to the doctrines he impugns, nor so fair a controvertist, nor so consistent a reasoner, nor so learned a polemic, as we hoped or feared to meet. His volume does not cast an additional ray of light on the controversy. On the contrary, it throws us back a century or two, and involves us in a wordy combat with obsolete and extinct errors, or imaginary opponents. So little justice has Dr. Copleston done either to himself or his subject, that he gravely cites Heylin as an historical authority, and Bishop Tomline as a theologian. All that is of much importance, is taken from Archbishop King and Dr. Laurence, in whose steps he closely follows, as a disciple of the one, and a coadjutor of the other. The for-

mer is perhaps the ablest of the Arminian divines; but his hypothesis has long since been met with a force of reasoning which will leave us no other merit than that of re-stating the considerations which Dr. Copleston has either overlooked or not condescended to notice, in answer to the arguments on which he so confidently relies.

The controversy respecting Necessity and Predestination divides itself into three distinct branches; the historical, the metaphysical, and the theological questions. We shall observe this division in our examination of the present Inquiry.

1. The history of religious opinions is a very interesting and curious branch of philosophical inquiry. It can afford us, however, little or no aid in the determination of a theological question. The time is past and gone, when the axioms of the Stagyrte, or the *dicta* of the beatific doctor, were held to be decisive, and when points of doctrine were settled, like points of law, by precedents and authorities. Among Protestants at least, the Scriptures are now professedly acknowledged as the only rule and ground of faith; and the mode of theological investigation has consequently undergone a most important revolution. What Calvin, or what Melancthon taught, is a matter of some historical interest, but is no longer of any real importance, since they have ceased to be authorities even to their professed disciples. No one in the present day considers himself as bound to hold or to defend what either may have advanced, merely because it was the sentiment of the theological leader, or of the nominal founder of the school to which he has attached himself. Not one Calvinist in a thousand, or in ten thousand, believes all that Calvin maintained, or concerns himself about the matter. So far as his system is received, it is received under the modifications which it has assumed in passing down to us through the writings of the English Reformers, and Puritans, and later divines. On the Continent, the schools of Geneva and of Amsterdam have alike degenerated, and the distinctive characters of their respective creeds are lost in the negative system and latitudinarian sentiments of modern Socinianism. Infidelity has made equal inroads on the Lutheran and the Calvinistic churches, and the doctrines originally common to both, have not been the last to be surrendered.

It has become fashionable to charge Augustine with having first introduced into the Church the controversies on this subject, which have so long disturbed her peace.* This misrepresentation can arise only from the wish to render the name of Calvin's master obnoxious. It is undeniable, that his exertions

* Quarterly Review. No. li. p. 89.

were called forth by the writings of Pelagius, to whom, therefore, the charge of disturbing the peace of the Church, if to any one, applies. But Pelagius only followed in the steps of Origen, whose writings, again, were directed against the antecedent errors of the Gnostics; and we know that by the "philosophy, and vain deceit," and "oppositions of science" falsely so called," either of that or of some similar heresy, the Church was troubled even in Apostolic days. The very few and imperfect remains of the first three centuries which have come down to us, do not furnish *data* for any peremptory assertion as to the state of religious controversy during that period. The Manichean heresy, however, which had its rise towards the close of the third century, is very plausibly supposed to be a branch or modification of the Gnostic system; while not only the errors of Cerinthus, but others of a Saducean character, some borrowed from the Jewish sects, and others from the Platonists, were the growth of the first century. The origin of the Predestination controversy may be traced to the Stoical and Peripatetic schools of heathen wisdom. All its elements, "the elements of this world," as St. Paul justly terms them, are to be found in the writings of Aristotle, whose astonishing empire over the human mind, forms one of the most remarkable facts in its history. The period at which the Aristotelian philosophy displaced the Platonic, may perhaps be safely assigned as the era from which we are to date the introduction into theology, of those metaphysical questions relative to fate and free-will, which succeeded to the Homœousian controversy. In the earlier ages of the Church, the writings of the Platonists were most in vogue. And Origen, who had been bred in the school of Alexandria, drew from the Platonic philosophy, the doctrines which he opposed to the Manichean errors. By degrees, as the love of system began to prevail, Aristotle took the place of Plato. But if, up to the time of Augustine, the Christian world had been but little disturbed with the question of Free-will, it was because other speculations equally subtle and perplexing had given full employment to the zeal and ingenuity of polemics and the irenical labours of ecclesiastical councils. The peace of the Church had sustained repeated interruptions far more violent and disastrous than that which was occasioned by the contest between the British heresiarch and the African bishop. And if Augustine was the first who framed into a system the doctrines of predestination and grace, it was because the errors of the Manicheans on the one hand, and the novel and rash assertions, the *ultra*-Origenism of Pelagius on the other, required on the part of the theologian a nicer discrimination, as well as a more explicit assertion of the Christian doctrine, than

had hitherto been called for, in order to guard against the opposite extremes. To the rise of doctrinal errors in the Apostolic days, we are indebted for some of the most striking and valuable exhibitions of the Christian doctrine which are contained in the New Testament. And it is but fair to acknowledge, that the subtile distinctions and verbal niceties in the ancient declarations of faith, and much of the rash speculation and metaphysical refinement of systematic theology, were occasioned by the multiplication of the heresies against which they were pointed. A morbid dread of some prevailing error has produced most of the exceptionable statements which are to be found in the writings of orthodox divines. The worst that can be said of Augustine as a polemical writer is, that his judgment was not equal to his genius, that he was more acute than profound, that his zeal was sometimes too impetuous, and his decisions too hasty and peremptory. It is remarkable, however, that in proportion as the Romish Church departed from the doctrines of Augustine, it deteriorated in purity both of faith and morals; and Luther, in declaiming against the nefarious traffic in indulgencies, took his stand on that system, the distinguishing features of which are, the corruption of human nature and the efficacy of Divine Grace. All the parts of the system of Predestination which are delineated in the writings of Augustine, were taught by Luther; and whatever difference might subsequently exist between him and Calvin on the subject of the Divine Decrees, no language can be stronger than that in which Luther insists on the moral impotence of man's depraved nature, in opposition to the Pelagian notion of free-will.

Whether the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England are or are not Calvinistic, is a question which has given rise to a great deal of quibbling. That Calvin had no hand in compiling them, is agreed on all sides; and it is equally certain, that they maintain a judicious silence on some of the more objectionable peculiarities of that great Reformer. They are known to have been drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, on the model of the Augsburg Confession; and Dr. Laurence has shewn, that the cautious phraseology in which they are worded, is strikingly in unison with the language uniformly employed by Melancthon, and with the character of Luther's later writings. Both of these Reformers appear to have been of opinion, that Calvin carried his notions of Predestination much too far; and a variety of passages have been collected out of their works by Dr. Laurence, directed against the rashness and inexpediency of speculating on the Divine will, except so far as it is revealed in the Scriptures. It might seem, then, to be

with little propriety, that the Articles of the Church are styled Calvinistic. Yet, taking that term in its *received* import, we have no hesitation in affirming that it strictly applies to them. For what is the acceptation of the word? Is it ever employed to denote a perfect accordance with Calvin in all that he taught? This cannot be the case, since those who, in this country, contend for the Calvinistic sense of the Articles, themselves reject that Reformer's notions of Church-government; to say nothing of the doctrinal points on which they dissent from him; while the Calvinists of the Continent have departed far more widely from their master. Does it imply an adherence to Calvin on those minor points on which he is supposed to have differed from the other Reformers? We apprehend that common usage is equally opposed to so restricted a use of the word; nor is it in this sense that Calvinists would accept the designation. Calvinism must be understood to mean the sentiments of the followers of Calvin; and what those sentiments are, must be gathered from their works. With any doctrines of Calvin which they have not adopted, they have properly no concern; since Calvinism, as the distinguishing sentiments of a sect, must consist in what they do hold, not in what they do not. The opinions peculiar to Calvin himself can with no more propriety be styled Calvinism, than he can be called a Calvinist, which would be to make him a follower of himself. We should not think of speaking of the opinions of any individual as Kingism, or Tomlinism, or Coplestonism. We always mean by such a phrase, the avowed opinions of the followers of a certain individual, employing it simply to prevent circumlocution. Any other use of it is dishonest, especially when the term is not chosen by the party so designated, and the authority of the individual is disclaimed by those who have adopted a modification of his system. It is usual to speak of the modern Unitarians as Socinians, and yet, they are known to differ very materially from Socinus, on which account they somewhat fastidiously object to the appellation. But the history of language would furnish many instances of a term of distinction being applied in a sense very different from its original and precise import.

The word Calvinist on the Continent, is synonymous, for the most part, with Presbyterian or Hugonot; and it is in reference to Church-government chiefly, that it is used in opposition to Lutheran. There were other doctrinal points, however, besides that of absolute Predestination, on which Luther and Calvin disagreed; in particular, with regard to the Eucharist, the Consubstantiation of the Lutheran Church being but a slight remove from the Transubstantiation of the Romish creed. The

term Calvinist has, therefore, a particular meaning in reference to this point. But in our own country, we believe, Calvinism has generally been employed to designate, not the doctrines on which Calvin differed in any degree from the other Reformers, but chiefly those on which all were agreed; the doctrines of Grace, as opposed to the Romish Predestination, and the *stantis vel cadentis Ecclesie articulus*, Justification by Faith. It is notorious, that Calvinistic is, with us, opposed, not to Lutheran or Melancthonian, but to Arminian and Pelagian; that it is used as implying an adherence to the doctrines taught by our own Reformers, by Ridley and Latimer, by Hooper and Bradford, by Gilpin and Jewel;—men who, we are now told, were not Calvinists. We must still affirm that they were; or, if they were not, that we have no Calvinists among us. That Calvin should have the honour of having bequeathed his name to the Reformed Faith, rather than any other of his coadjutors, may appear unreasonable; but such is the fact, and it will not be easy to deprive him of it. The childish hostility to the name of this great man, manifested by the English clergy, is utterly unworthy of an enlightened age. If it is a mere point of honour that is contended for, that the Articles of the Church, although in the usual sense of the word decidedly Calvinistic, shall not be called so, because Calvin was a Presbyterian, or for any other equally good reason, let it, for the sake of peace, be conceded. But then advantage must not be taken of this concession, to fix on these Articles an anti-Calvinistic interpretation, which is not less anti-Lutheran, and which, in their natural or plain grammatical import, they will not bear. Yet, this is what has been attempted by the right reverend Refuter of Calvinism; and this also is the object of the Episcopal innovations of his lordship of Peterborough, in introducing a rider of eighty-seven questions expository of the Articles. The gross perversion of their obvious import, which is conspicuous in those questions, affords a convincing proof, that whether they speak the sentiments of Calvin or not, they favour somewhat too strongly the notions of modern Calvinists, and convey a meaning exceedingly liable to be understood by plain people in a Calvinistic sense.

The issue of the question relating to the Thirty-nine Articles might fairly be staked on this: Do they, or do they not express the sentiments of that class of persons in this country who are denominated Calvinists, including the larger body of the evangelical clergy? We allude more particularly to the 9th, 10th, 13th, and 17th Articles; and we ask, Would the Calvinistic clergy, or would they not, if left to frame articles for themselves, prefer any other mode of expression, in order to convey

their notions of the doctrines in question? Are these articles felt by them to be deficient or equivocal? Or do they not go as far as any sober and enlightened Calvinist would venture to go in a declaration of his own faith? To determine this question, we need only inquire who, on the one hand, are the men who the most constantly and fearlessly appeal to those Articles, adopting their phraseology in their writings and discourses, and interpreting by them whatever is of doubtful or exceptionable import in the formularies of the Church; and who, on the other, are the party who are afraid to let those Articles speak for themselves, and who maintain in their public instructions, a religious silence on points, the "godly consideration" of which is affirmed to be "full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons," tending "to establish and confirm their faith," and to "kindle their love towards God." Is there not something disingenuous, then, to say the least, in the play upon words, by which Dr. Copleston attempts to shift the difficulty of proving that their opinions may be reconciled with the Articles, off from his own party to the shoulders of the evangelical clergy? First, Calvinism is made to stand for the doctrine of absolute decrees both of Election and Reprobation; next, having fixed this arbitrary and obnoxious meaning on the word, he imputes this Calvinism to all those who go by the name of Calvinists; and then, he very safely, but very unmeaningly, calls upon them to prove that this caricature of Calvinism is sanctioned by the Articles. If this single point of the Calvinistic system were indeed all that distinguishes it from other systems, there would be some colour for making it to consist in certain notions of Predestination; although even then, the avowed differences among Calvinists, as denoted not only by the obsolete distinctions of sublapsarian and supralapsarian, but by the more popular phrases, high Calvinist and moderate Calvinist, might have suggested some qualification of the charge insinuated against all who substantially receive the Calvinistic doctrine. But we might appeal to the writings of those who pass for Calvinistic divines, both Episcopalians and Dissenters, in proof that the language and even the notions of Calvin on that head, have not been retained; that they are not considered as essential to his system, but rather as a morbid excrescence upon it; and that the term Calvinism has no such meaning, in popular usage, as Dr. Copleston would fasten upon it. The doctrine of Reprobation has been again and again explicitly disavowed by modern Calvinists, while many have gone so far as to admit the impropriety of much that is to be found in the writings of elder theologians on the subject of Particular Redemption. Yet, by retaining the name of Calvinist, they shewed that, at least in

their view, the essence of the system did not consist in those abstruse speculations which, judging from Dr. Copleston's statement and the misrepresentations of the Arminian writers, one would imagine to have been all that Calvin had at heart, the constant theme of his pen, and the fundamental article of his faith. That Calvinism does not mean simply or chiefly a belief in absolute decrees of Election and Reprobation, we can prove from still higher authority, if possible, than the writings of Calvinists themselves. Were we to refer Dr. Copleston to the works of such obscure theologians as Scott and Williams, Fuller and Newton, for an exhibition of modern Calvinism, he might object to receive their works in evidence. We will content ourselves, therefore, with serving a *subpana* on the Bishop of Winchester as a witness to the fact, that by Calvinism is intended something much more than certain notions of Predestination. The Calvinism his Lordship has undertaken to refute, is precisely the Calvinism of the Thirty-nine Articles; that is to say, it is the Calvinism of Luther, and Bucer, and Zwingli, of Cranmer and Tindal, of Ridley and Latimer; it is the Calvinism of the Homilies, of the best days of the Church of England, and of all the foreign Reformed Churches. If this be a misnomer, if what all these reformers and divines held in common, be not Calvinism, his Lordship has either erred in his title-page, or has blundered throughout his work; for while he denies that they were Calvinists, reserving that appellation for Simon Magus and other ancient heretics, as the only fit company for the Geneva Reformer, nothing is more certain than that they held the very doctrines which he supposes to be peculiar to Calvinism, and which are held by modern Calvinists. We will not go quite so far as Bishop Horsley did when he said, speaking of certain acrimonious declaimers against Calvinism in his day, who had acquired much applause and reputation, but with no real knowledge of their subject, 'Give me the principles on which these writers argue, and I will undertake to convict, I will not say Arminians only, and Archbishop Laud; but, upon these principles, I will undertake to convict the fathers of the Council of Trent, of Calvinism.' We will say, however, that on Bishop Tomline's principles, it would be easy to prove Calvin himself to have been an anti-Calvinist, and equally easy to bring in the Apostles guilty of all sorts of heresy.

The consent given by the British divines to the decrees of the Synod of Dort, has been adduced by Dr. Hill as 'a proof that the Churches of England and of Scotland, by whom they were sent, adhered to the Calvinistic tenets, and that James I., who had joined his influence with that of the House of Orange in the convocation of the Synod, was disposed to

'favour that system.' Among those who subscribed and attested its articles, are found the names of George Carleton, Bishop of Landaff; John Davenant, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge; Thomas Goad, Precentor of St. Paul's; and Walter Balcanqual, a Scotch presbyter. Davenant was the author of a very able defence of the Calvinistic system, in answer to Hoard, an Arminian. Although the accordance of the decisions of that Synod with the doctrines of Calvin, cannot be questioned, yet, Mosheim is incorrect in representing that the Geneva Confession and the creed of Calvin were what the opposers of Arminius wished to impose, and the Remonstrants resisted. The Confession and Catechism of the Belgic Churches alone were appealed to in the contest; and Arminius was accused of deviating, not from the opinions of Calvin, but from the Confessions to which he was bound to adhere. The only way in which Calvin is ever mentioned in the "history" published by order of the States General, is, along with others, as an eminent doctor of the Reformed Churches. Thus, Arminius is accused of having vehemently attacked the reputation and authority of the most illustrious doctors, Calvin, Zanchius, Beza, Martyr, Ursinus, and others; and his disciples are represented as glorying in the profession of an entirely new theology. 'It was not then supposed,' remarks Mr. Scott, 'that there was any essential difference between the doctrine of the Church at Geneva and that of the other Reformed Churches.*' The opinions attributed to the Synod of Dort by Heylin after Tilenus, in his abbreviations of the articles, are chargeable neither on the Belgic Churches, nor on Calvin himself: they are a gross and shameless misrepresentation. This Mr. Scott has clearly proved by confronting them with the real articles of that Synod, from which they differ, not only as an unfair abridgement, but as containing interpolated clauses to which there is nothing answering in the original. Dr. Copleston could not surely have seen this publication, or he would not, after this exposure of the unprincipled conduct of Heylin or his authority, have printed these spurious 'conclusions' in his appendix, as 'the most moderate and impartial account of the proceedings' of the Synod.

On the same ground, then, that the Church of England Articles are denied to be Calvinistic, because Calvin had no hand in them, it might fairly be argued that those of the Synod of Dort are not chargeable with Calvinism. The word Calvinist is never once used in the historical preface. Nor did the con-

* Scott's Synod of Dort. p. 13.

troversy turn upon those points only which Dr. Copleston has thought proper to exhibit as the distinguishing tenets of the Geneva school. The main dispute was, not about Election and Reprobation, but about Justification. In the conference between Arminius and Gomarus, in 1609, the former was particularly anxious that the article of Predestination should be first discussed, while the latter urged, that, because the article respecting Justification '*seemed more necessary*,' the beginning should be made with that. And when, three years after, the Count of Nassau earnestly recommended the heads of the contending parties to see whether some honourable way might not be found out of composing so deplorable a schism, Festus Hommius declared, 'that if the Remonstrants differed from the rest of the
' pastors in no other articles than those five concerning predesti-
' nation and the heads annexed to it, he thought that a way
' might be found out, in which some peace might be established
' between the parties, until the whole controversy should be
' settled by a national Synod;' but 'that there were weighty
' reasons which led the churches to believe, that most of the
' Remonstrants dissented from the doctrine of the Belgic
' Churches in more articles, and *those of greater importance*.' This, though disclaimed by Utenbogardus for himself, was notoriously the case with Vorstius, Venator, and several others of the Remonstrant party. The opinions of Vorstius differed but little, if at all, from the Socinian system; and yet, the Remonstrants expressly declared, 'that they had nothing against
' him, nor had they detected in his writings any thing repug-
' nant to truth and piety.' This circumstance, Mosheim admits, 'rendered the Arminians particularly odious;' and our own James I. thought himself called upon to admonish the States General, 'as well by letters as by his own ambassador, not
' to admit a man infamous by so many and so great errors and
' blasphemies, to the public office of teaching in the University.' In the conference held at the Hague, Feb. 1613, the orthodox pastors again declared their readiness to come to an amicable adjustment of their differences with the Remonstrants, provided the latter 'would assure the churches, by a sincere and
' open declaration, that they thought differently from those re-
' formed churches *in no other heads of doctrine except the five ar-
' ticles*.' That is, as the Editor of Mosheim expresses it, 'pro-
' vided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism.' 'But
' since the Illustrious the States, two years before, (Dec. 3, 1611)
' had by name expressed six heads of doctrine, concerning
' which they forbid to be taught otherwise than it had been
' hitherto delivered to the Belgic churches: namely, concerning
' the perfect satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ for our sins,

‘ the justification of man before God, saving faith, original sin, the assurance (or certitude) of salvation, and the perfection of man in this life ; they in the first place demanded, that they would declare concerning these articles, that they embraced the opinion expressed in the Confession and Catechism of these churches, which they the other pastors had comprised from the same in certain written theses ; and that they rejected the contrary opinion, proposed in certain anti-theses, from the writings of Arminius, Bertius, Vorstius, Venator, and others.’* This the Remonstrants declined. So far is it from being the fact, that these differences mainly respected absolute Predestination, or any thing peculiar to the Calvinistic system, or that the Synod of Dort, how objectionable soever the mode resorted to for terminating the controversy, was convoked for party ends, or for the purpose of imposing on the Remonstrants the creed of Geneva.

But although, at that period, both king James and his bishops discovered this disposition to favour what is generally called Calvinism, it was not long before events, chiefly, remarks Dr. Hill, of a political nature, occasioned a revolution upon this point in the sentiments of James, and of those members of the Church of England who were attached to the cause of monarchy. There can be no doubt that the disgust which James early conceived against the Presbyterian discipline, paved the way for the change in his theological sentiments. His well-known saying, ‘ No bishop, no king,’ and the ‘ king-craft’ on which he prided himself, together with his irreligious and licentious character, afford the only satisfactory explanation of his strange and sudden abandonment of his educational principles. In the reign of Charles I., the countenance of the Court was confined to the divines who favoured the Arminian system ; and although the controversy was forbidden ground, Archbishop Laud wrote a treatise to prove, that the Articles admit of an Arminian sense. The ideal connexion between the Arminian theology and Episcopacy, the Calvinistic system and Presbyterianism, was rivetted on the prejudices of the nation by the transactions of the succeeding reigns. ‘ No person,’ remarks Principal Hill, ‘ who is acquainted with the history of the factions of that country (England), can entertain a doubt, that political causes have contributed very largely to the disrepute in which Calvinism has been held by many dignified and learned members of the English Church.’ But, unhappily, these causes have produced a departure, not merely from the creed of Calvin, but equally from that of Luther and Melancthon himself, from the doctrines common to the German and the English Reformers.

* Scott’s Synod of Dort. p. 71.

No instance occurs in history, of a deviation from the creeds of the Reformed Churches in those points which are more properly called Calvinistic, that has not issued in a deviation in those doctrines which are more generally allowed to be essential to vital Christianity. Bishop Horsley, in warning his clergy to beware how they aimed their shafts at Calvinism, before they knew what is Calvinism and what is not, admits that a great part of that which is now ignorantly called Calvinism, 'is closely interwoven with the very rudiments of Christianity.' And Dr. Copleston ingenuously confesses, that he has often been dissatisfied with the attempts made to refute the Calvinistic opinions; 'attempts which seemed to me,' he adds, 'often to retain as much error on their own side, as they exposed on the opposite, and to deprive Christianity of much of that spiritual and vital force which is its main characteristic and essential property.' Into the nature and tendency of his own attempt, we shall presently inquire; but in the mean time, we wish to submit to his consideration this important fact. He virtually concedes, that Calvinism is so closely identified, in the minds of many persons, with all that is spiritual in Christianity, that its opponents have found it difficult to steer clear of attacking Christianity itself. We can assure him that, in the popular mind, this association is too strong and of too long a standing ever to be dissolved. By Calvinism, nine people out of ten will always persist in understanding the doctrines of Justification by Faith and Divine Grace, as expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles; doctrines which are known to be the main subject of the Calvinistic preaching, and which their opponents either consign to silence, or present (for the most part) in a garbled form. What Calvin himself held respecting Absolute Decrees, they neither know nor care. It is enough for the irreligious, that here is an obnoxious term ready to their hand, which it suits their purpose to employ in order to fix opprobrium on any doctrines which, in their opinion, savour of Methodism; while to plain Christians, the knowledge that the reproach of Calvinism is directed against the most essential doctrines of Christianity, naturally leads them to employ that term in designating the fundamental articles of the Reformed Faith. Now, this being the case, how incorrectly soever the word in question may, in the first instance, have been applied to those doctrines, it is not in Dr. Copleston's power to make persons in general understand, that when he writes against Calvinism, he means only one particular tenet, which Calvin held two centuries ago, and that he does not at all mean to speak of the Calvinism of the present day as taught in the writings of

our standard theologians. When they hear that the Thirty-nine Articles are proved by a learned Prebendary to be anti-Calvinistic, they will naturally conclude, if they believe so strange a paradox, that either the evangelical clergy or else the Articles themselves, are all in the wrong. For how can it enter the heads of plain people, that those who have so long gone by the name of Calvinists, are, after all, not Calvinists, because they do not hold a certain notion, which most of their hearers never heard of? By avowing himself, then, an anti-Calvinist, and by employing his talents to strengthen the prejudice against Calvinism, Dr. Copleston will have served the cause of a party, and, although we are persuaded it was not his intention, will have contributed to aggravate and extend the odium which attaches to the name. But he will not have succeeded in doing any thing towards rendering the doctrines of the Thirty-nine Articles palatable to the party who are dissatisfied with them in their obvious interpretation, nor towards reconciling to 'curious and carnal persons,' what he himself deems vital parts of the Christian system. The doctrines of Predestination and Election and of Justification by Faith, will, under any form, be to the self-righteous a stumbling block, and to the sceptic foolishness. Nothing can render them attractive to the minds of worldly or unregenerate persons. The popular outcry against Calvinism, originates in a deeply rooted disaffection to the humbling doctrines of the Gospel: it is at once an ignorant and an irreligious outcry. Dr. Copleston's work, will, we fear, have the effect of abetting and encouraging this vulgar and indiscriminate hostility. Those who cannot follow him into his reasonings, will be glad to plead his authority. He will be claimed as an auxiliary by men with whom he has little in common in temper, sentiment, or principle. And after all, he may depend upon it, that all that is spiritual and vital in Christianity, even in his own account, will, out of Oxford, go by the name of Calvinism.

2. We proceed to the consideration of the metaphysical inquiries which form the immediate subject of the volume.

The first discourse has for its object, to invalidate the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity, by arguing, that, in proportion as the doctrine is really believed, motives must cease to operate; that consequently, that doctrine being true, the perfection of our knowledge would destroy all motive to action; and thus, that the improvement of our mental powers would lead to the extinction of moral principle.

In the second discourse, the Author labours to shew, that the doctrines of God's Providence and man's free-will, are each

separately demonstrable, but that their congruity is by us inconceivable.

In the third, this reasoning is transferred to the doctrine of Predestination, and the rule of analogical reasoning laid down by Archbishop King, is stated and vindicated at considerable length.

In the fourth, the doctrine of the Church of England in the Seventeenth Article, is represented as conformable to the principles laid down in the preceding inquiry, and the subject is more distinctly brought under notice in its religious bearings.

For the leading argument in the first discourse, Dr. Copleston confesses himself indebted to a small treatise by a Mr. Dawson, entitled, "The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity briefly invalidated." In that work, three axioms are laid down as the premises of the reasoning by which it is attempted to reduce the doctrine of Necessity to an absurdity, by shewing that its practical effect, when believed, must be to destroy activity by suspending the operation of motive. We have no fault to find with the axioms, save that the first appears to us not quite unexceptionable in its terms, since a just inference from a false supposition may involve a degree of error that is neither a contradiction nor an absurdity. The second is only a different mode of stating the proposition, that the will never acts without a motive, since every effect must have a cause; a proposition which lies at the foundation of the reasonings of philosophical necessitarians. The third is, that practical principles can operate only so far as they are at the time believed to be true: it is by our belief in them that they are brought into contact with the mind; and a thing cannot operate where it is not. We have no conception how these axioms can afford the least aid to Dr. Copleston in his inquiry. He appears to us, however, to furnish in the very outset, an illustration of the truth of the first axiom, by making a supposition which, as being in itself false, can only lead to absurd inferences. He seems to us completely to confound the two distinct ideas of *knowledge* and *expectation*, by representing foreknowledge in God, as only the perfection of what is simple expectation in man. He represents our belief in God's foreknowledge as suggested by, if it does not rest upon, our own consciousness of a certain power of foresight, which, after all, is nothing more than the expectation grounded on experience.

'Since human wisdom,' he says, 'often arrives at such a degree of certainty about future events, that for all the purposes of life our foreknowledge is as much to be depended upon as our actual knowledge, as, for instance, that the sun will rise to-morrow—that the tide will ebb and

flow at a given time—since, I say, experience teaches us this of ourselves, it is no violent step, but a natural and easy transition, to attribute this faculty in a much higher degree to God—or rather to conceive it as existing in him without any limitation at all.

This is, in other words, affirming, that prescience, as a Divine perfection, is no otherwise conceivable by us, than as *infinitely wise expectation*, and that we arrive at this idea by the consciousness of expectation in ourselves, together with the experience of a certain established order in the succession of events, on which that expectation is built. Now, in the first place, if a person examines his own mind, he will, we think, find that his belief in the Divine foreknowledge has no such origin; and next, we observe, that so far as expectation is a rational principle, it very mainly rests on an antecedent belief in the providence and consequent foreknowledge of God. There is what may be called an instinctive expectation, founded simply on experience, and having no pretension to foresight or knowledge, which leads the child to expect the continuance or return of whatever gives him pleasure. His expectation that the sun will rise on the morrow, is quite as strong as that of the philosopher who is acquainted with the laws of nature. This sort of expectation has an existence even in animals. But, so far as expectation is a *rational* principle, it rests on a knowledge of the causes or principles of things; and those principles are always connected with the appointment of the Creator, beyond which our knowledge of causes can rarely go. In fact, so far from arguing the Divine prescience from our own expectation, we rest our expectation of the continuance of the settled course of nature, on a belief in the Divine appointment, and on the appearances of wise design and benevolence which the works of God exhibit. Our foresight in other matters is nothing more than a calculation of probabilities, which we are never for a moment tempted to identify, either in ourselves or in others, with prescience. On the contrary, whensoever the foresight of events assumes the character of prediction, we either resent it as an impious pretence, or instantly refer it to a supernatural agency. So perfectly distinct are our ideas of prescience and foresight or reasonable expectation, that we never conceive of them as the same kind of knowledge, which would be the case if they differed only in their degree, but start even at the semblance of foreknowledge when some accidental coincidence has occurred in correspondence to a pretended prediction, as bearing on the face of it a supernatural character; and we get rid of this impression only by referring it to accident. It is not true, then, that our idea of God as knowing things before-hand, proceeds from our concluding

that 'God must see into futurity better than man can see; as one man sees better than another according to the strength of his faculties and his superior acquaintance with the constitution of the universe.' No such process of comparison takes place in the mind, because it is felt that there is no ground for comparison in any conceivable analogy. Man cannot see an instant into futurity: he cannot know that he shall continue to exist through the next moment. How strong and reasonable soever his expectation of life, he knows that there is a possible alternative altogether beyond the reach of his knowledge and of his control. But he also firmly believes, that this contingent event comes within the sphere of the Divine knowledge; and the most unpractised thinker, the most thoughtless mortal believes, that the hour of his death, like every other future event, is appointed by that Being in whom he lives and on whom he depends.

We arrive, as it seems to us, at the idea of the Divine foreknowledge, exactly in the same way as we arrive at the idea of God himself; and it is impossible to separate the idea of God from that of his essential natural perfections, of which this is one. The child, as soon as he is capable of reflection, is taught to ask himself who made him and made all things. His idea of the being, the greatness, and the knowledge of God, is obtained, not by noticing the skill and power displayed in the works of man, and arguing from them the greater skill and power that must exist in the former of the Universe,—the mode of comparison answering to that suggested by Dr. Copleston,—but is received immediately from the works of God and from his own consciousness. The ideas of Omnipotence and Omniscience are developed together; and of the Being who can do all things, he can only think as of a Being who knows all things. The mode of the Divine knowledge, as well as the mode of the Divine presence, he is led from the very dawn of reason to regard as altogether transcending his conception,—as wholly different from that of any visible being however wise and powerful; since, in the act of prayer, he is taught to recognise this knowledge and presence as extending to his every thought and pervading every place. The idea of prescience is distinct from that of omniscience. But this too is involved in the expectation of receiving future benefits in answer to prayer; it is inseparable from a belief in God's providence; it is directly inculcated by the prophecies of the Old Testament; and it is strengthened by all the impressions which the mind receives of a plan, or settled law, or wise appointment, in the events which are daily coming to pass. Such appears to us to be the real origin of our notions of the Divine foreknowledge.

' If a man makes a false supposition, and reasons justly from it, a contradiction or an absurdity will be contained in the conclusion.' If the preceding remarks are correct, we have only to apply the Author's own axiom, to shew the absurdity of all the inferences which he builds on premises so fallacious. All reasoning from human expectation to the Divine prescience, must be manifestly unsound, because we can get *no* 'idea of what *his* knowledge is, by our own.' Between human expectation and the course of events, there is known to be absolutely no connexion. But it does not follow that there is no connexion between what comes to pass and the Divine foreknowledge. On the contrary, it is inevitable to believe, that such a connexion exists, although the nature of it transcends our knowledge. We do not believe that God's foreknowledge causes the event, or 'drags the event along with it,' as Dr. Copleston expresses it; but we cannot avoid arguing that foreknowledge from the general course of events; we cannot separate the idea of prescience from that of a plan or scheme of Providential government; and we therefore conclude, that all events, *with their causes*, are included in the Divine knowledge. 'All I maintain is,' says Dr. Copleston, 'that the notion of God's *foreknowledge* ought not to interfere in the slightest degree with our belief in the *contingency* of events and the *freedom* of human actions.' But if he maintained no more than this, there would be no occasion for his writing a book to prove what no one is so insane as to deny. The freedom of human actions cannot in the nature of things be affected by God's foreknowledge of them. Nor does it interfere with the contingency of events, using that word in the popular, and, we may add, the only correct or intelligible sense, as denoting events the causes of which are not discernible by us, and which, for any thing we know, might have been otherwise.

It is one thing to assert, that between the event and God's knowledge of the event, there is a connexion; and another thing to maintain, that that connexion is the connexion of cause and effect, or that the former is *caused* by the latter. 'Infallible foreknowledge,' President Edwards has remarked, 'may *prove* the necessity of the event foreknown, and yet not be the thing that *causes* the necessity.' He means the necessity of consequence, as an effect arising out of its foreseen cause. 'But infallible foreknowledge,' rejoins Dr. Copleston,

'while it remains foreknowledge, *proves* nothing. When the being which possesses this foreknowledge, *declares* that a thing will come to pass, that declaration indeed proves, or is a certain ground of assurance to

us, that it *will* come to pass. Even then it does not prove the event to be necessary.' p. 45, note.

We have reason strongly to suspect that our Author, though he cites Jonathan Edwards more than once, and allows him to have been a writer of great acuteness and ability, has not done himself the justice to read his work through, since he obviously mistakes the meaning of the terms which, in the beginning of the Treatise, Edwards is most careful to define. It is difficult to understand in what sense Dr. Copleston can maintain the proposition, that when God has declared that a certain event shall come to pass, even then the predicted event is not necessary; that is, might be otherwise. Necessary in its own nature, as a metaphysical truth, the denial of which involves a contradiction,—necessary in the same sense as that in which it is a necessary truth, that two and two make four; or necessary in the sense of an obligation laid upon us; the event cannot be. And if our Author means to affirm no more than this, he is merely playing off a pun against Edwards's argument. But the terms of the position being understood, its truth might seem to be incontrovertible, that what God reveals to us as future, is inevitably certain; its certainty being proved to us by the prediction, though not necessitated by it. Edwards never maintains, as our Author seems to imagine, that foreknowledge implies a necessity of nature, or an *a priori* necessity, in the thing foreknown; and it is a pity that he did not give himself the trouble requisite to understand his language, before he ventured to speak of subjecting the knowledge of God to 'absurd, and unphilosophical, and impious limitations,' by 'mixing up the idea of God's foreknowledge with any quality in the things foreknown.' All that Edwards contends for, is a necessity of consequence, the necessity of cause and effect, in reference to events which, as effects, are known to us to be certain because foretold, although the causes on which they depend for coming to pass are unknown to us. What he maintains is, that every event, through all its chain of antecedent causes physical and moral, must be known to God; that, as connected with that chain of causes, it must, as a necessary consequence, result from them; and the proof of this is, that its futurity as existing in the Divine knowledge, is made certain to us by the declaration that it will be. 'Infallible foreknowledge, while it remains foreknowledge,' says Dr. Copleston, (by which we suppose he means, while it remains an attribute in the Divine mind, and does not discover itself by any actual communication,) 'proves nothing.' It proves nothing to us as to the necessity or futurity of particular events. But as God's foreknowledge does not cause the event to come to pass, so

neither does the declaration of that foreknowledge operate as a cause. Its being predicted, makes no difference in this respect. And if so, those events which are foretold, are no otherwise foreknown by God, than all other events are. In the Divine mind, predicted events cannot be more certain, and to us they are not less contingent, than events the futurity of which is unrevealed. All events being in these respects alike, it follows, that what the circumstance of an event's being foretold, proves with regard to that particular event, it also proves with regard to all other events. And what it proves, according to President Edwards, is this: That, whereas to us, the series of events which are coming to pass, are known only as effects following one upon another contingently, that is, without any apparent cause why they so happened rather than otherwise,—to the Divine mind, to which all effects are known in their causes, these events are present as consequences necessarily arising out of their antecedents; and it is this incommunicable attribute of knowing things in their causes,—the causes which determine that contingent events shall fall out in the manner in which they come to pass rather than otherwise,—which enables the Divine Being to arrange his infinitely wise plans, without doing violence to the free agency of his creatures.

That which is foretold as future, must be in itself certain: it is henceforth necessary that it should happen. But if the circumstance of its being foretold does not necessitate it, then it was not less certain in itself, not less certainly future, before its futurity was revealed. And if this is true of one event, it is true of all events. All events are foreseen by God in their infallible connexion with their causes or antecedents, together with the reasons why they are permitted to take place; in proof of which, some of these events have been clearly foretold long before they were brought to pass by the free agency of men. This is what is meant by their being necessary, or certain; and in what respect this notion of God's foreknowledge and of the sort of necessity implied by it, interferes with the freedom of human actions, Dr. Copleston would find it no easy matter to shew: he has not ventured to make the attempt. In the following passage, there is, however, a most unwarrantable misrepresentation of what he is pleased to term 'the doctrine of philosophical necessity or predestination confined to this life.' As he refers to no author, it is impossible to say to whom he means his 'fair statement' to apply; but, as his readers will apply it, it is a statement at utter variance with fact and with controversial integrity.

'Let us now attend to the graver question, whether, because God made the world and all things in it, therefore every thing that happens,

human conduct as well as the rest, must be regarded as proceeding from him, and determined beforehand by his direction, in all its detail. Whatever has been, is, or will be, could not, as some say, be otherwise. We, vain and insignificant creatures, full of our own importance, imagine that we act from ourselves, that we can deliberate, choose, reject, command, forbid, contrive, hasten or hinder a thousand things, when in fact this is all delusion—all the creation of our own fancy. We are but members of the machine, like the rest; and though we may please ourselves with thinking that we act an independent part, the real truth is, we have no voice, no power, no control in what is going on: all would take its course just the same, whether for good or for ill, were we to give ourselves no anxiety or concern whatever in the matter.

Such, I believe, is a *fair statement* of the doctrine of philosophical necessity, or predestination confined to this life. It is not with a view of restraining our inquiry to this sterile and unprofitable field, that I have now entered upon it; but it has a close connexion with certain religious opinions relating to another life, which harass and perplex many minds, and which, when they assume a certain determinate form and aspect, cause one of the most melancholy corruptions of our faith to which a Christian can be subject. And since the ground on which the doctrine of necessity rests, is the same with that on which the creed of the Calvinist is built, although the latter defends his opinions also by the language of Scripture, and considers that to be his strong hold; yet, whatever discredit can be thrown upon the doctrine of *fatalism* in this life, may be at once transferred to the doctrine of *predestination* in another, as far as the appeal is made to human reason in support of that doctrine. And if the view which I propose to take of the question as it relates to this life be correct, it will also serve to explain *by analogy* many of those difficulties which occur to the reader of holy Scripture; and will account for those frequent declarations concerning God's purposes and decrees respecting a future life, without admitting the bold and dangerous construction which the Calvinist fastens upon them, and which, *if unhappily he lived up to his opinions*, would go far to defeat the gracious end and design of the Gospel altogether.' pp. 7—9.

We shall not waste many words in pointing out the gross misstatements and the uncharitable insinuations which are contained in this short paragraph. That the Calvinists do not live up to the inferences Dr. Copleston is pleased to draw from their principles, is true; but that they do not live up to their own views, is what no person can have a right to affirm. It is an indecent and an arrogant assertion; and the more so, as it occurs at the outset of a professed philosophical 'inquiry,' since it involves a begging of the question in dispute. But we pass on to examine our Author's reasonings. His main argument is this; that, 'of the two grand motives which actuate reasonable beings, hope and fear, the influence is always diminished in proportion to the opinion men have of the unalterable conditions under which they are placed.' He

illustrates this position by two familiar instances,—the effect of our own Poor Laws, and the calm, unresisting submission of a criminal condemned to perish; and refers, in further support of his argument, to the memorable case of the plague at Athens.

Now, that the extinction of hope and fear leads to a state of absolute passiveness and inactivity, and that in proportion as these motives are weakened, an approach is made to such a state, must be instantly admitted: the position stands in no need of illustration. But the real question at issue is, whether the doctrine of even the fatalist has this tendency to extinguish motive and paralyse exertion. Dr. Copleston is studious not to explain to whom he refers under that appellation; but we will take the Mahomedan fatalist, and we ask him to explain how it comes to pass, that the Turkish soldiers have often displayed a coolness, an intrepidity, and a persevering courage, the very reverse of this inactivity. Will he say that they do not act up to their opinions? This would be absurd, since it is well known that their courage is greatly inspired by their notion of absolute predestination, and that this notion operates so powerfully as to lead to an utter contempt of danger. But we need not go so far from home for an illustration of the utter fallacy of the Author's reasoning. It is a common saying among our own soldiers, among those who are no Calvinists, but regular Church of England men, that 'every bullet has its billet.' What is this but the doctrine of fatalism? And yet, what other influence has this notion, than to stimulate to that fearless exertion by which British soldiers and sailors are so remarkably distinguished? And who are the men who have at all times conducted the most perilous undertakings, who have succeeded in the noblest achievements? They have uniformly been characterized, either by an enlightened and pious confidence in the *particular* Providence of the God whom they feared, or, as has been strikingly instanced in many of the most adventurous travellers and navigators, by a very strong impression of an over-ruling destiny, partaking of the Mahomedan fatalism.

These instances might seem sufficient to overturn the Author's reasoning as to the paralyzing effect of the doctrine of the fatalist; but it is necessary to examine the illustrations he has himself brought forward. And these, if we do not mistake, will of themselves supply a confutation of his argument. To take the case of the condemned criminal. The fatalist believes that every event is unalterably pre-determined: the nature of the event, as well as the precise time of its happening, the what, the how, and the when, it is impossible for him to foresee. The case of the criminal, to afford a parallel fit for the

argument, should be that of a man who knows that it is unalterably determined that either the sentence shall be executed, or that it shall not, but which way the matter is determined, he has no means of knowing. All that he must be supposed to know is, that his case has undergone a special consideration, the result of which he can in no way change, since it is ultimate, and leaves no room for appeal; but he is unacquainted with the nature of that result. In this state of awful uncertainty, it is very possible that he may resign himself to a callous indifference; but it is much more probable, that he would be agitated with the extremes of hope and fear; and though he can do nothing, this arises not from the extinction of motive, but from the physical restraint laid on his powers of action. But a physical restraint in the case of the fatalist, is not supposed to exist even in imagination. The inactivity induced by the notion of fatalism, is ascribed to the suspension of rational motive. We have already shewn that this effect does not take place: and Dr. Copleston's illustration enables us to shew *why* it does not take place, namely, because the cases are totally dissimilar. Dr. Copleston has mistaken a contrast for a parallel.

But how shall we account for so strange a blunder in an Oxford divine? We entreat our readers to turn back to the Author's own statement, and then judge for themselves, whether he has not been guilty of confounding foreknowledge itself with a belief in fore-appointment,—a belief that things are unalterably fixed, with a knowledge of things as fixed. For, in the supposed case of the criminal, it is obviously not the mere knowledge that the alternative of life or death has been finally determined upon, with regard to his particular case, which extinguishes hope, but his knowledge of what that certain sentence is,—of its nature, of the precise day and hour, and of all the circumstances attending its execution. Is there any thing in the slightest degree analogous to this, in the belief of the most infatuated fatalist? The knowledge of the criminal, is, in effect, foreknowledge; and no one will deny that absolute foreknowledge would tend to destroy both motive and the power of enjoyment. The fatalist would readily admit, that it is in mercy that the precise moment and the circumstances of his death are hidden from him. He would deprecate such foreknowledge, were it possible. But Dr. Copleston has undertaken to shew, that a belief in the absolute predestination of events in general, must have the same effect on the mind, as a foreknowledge of particular events, or what practically amounts to foreknowledge in the given case, has been found to produce. We ask, how has he proved it? What shadow of an

argument has he adduced? His other illustrations will not serve his purpose better, since, while that of the Poor Laws is a comparison singularly loose and inapt, they both confound a definite with an indefinite expectation,—a belief in the unalterableness of events, with the knowledge of a specific provision or an inevitable doom,—a belief in Divine predetermination, with a species of actual foreknowledge.

We return to Dr. Copleston's axiom: 'If we make a false supposition, and reason justly from it, a contradiction or an absurdity will be contained in the conclusion.' The false supposition, here, respects the imaginary parallel, which accounts for the absurdity we before shewed to lie in the conclusion.

As we are not vindicating the Mahommedan fatalism, it does not belong to us to point out either the fallacy on which it proceeds, or the evil consequences to which it leads. Even fatalism, however, may be distinguished from the gross and brutal stupidity that pretends to find a reason in the doctrine, which it does not supply. Leibnitz remarks, that the idea of Necessity *ill understood*, and reduced to practice, has given birth to what he calls *fatum Mahometanum*, 'le destin à la Turquie'; which he distinguishes from the *fatum Stoicum*; and that again, on account of the principles on which it rests, from what he calls *fatum Christianum*, or a belief in a superintending Providence. We should rather say, fatalism is the idea of *Providence ill understood*; or a belief in God's natural perfections, separate from a confidence in his moral perfections as the wise and merciful Governor as well as absolute Sovereign of the Universe. The exclusion of this idea of God as the Moral Governor of his creatures, is that which mainly distinguishes from the Calvinistic doctrine of Providence, fatalism on the one hand, and the antinomian heresy on the other. Both errors originate in that species of sophism which may be termed *half-truths*. 'It is false,' remarks Leibnitz, 'that the event takes place in spite of whatever you do: it will take place because you do what leads to it; and if the event is predetermined, the cause which will bring it on is predetermined also. Thus, the connexion of effects and causes, far from establishing the doctrine of a necessity prejudicial to morals, serves to destroy it.*' It is, in fact, a necessity which grounds itself on the operation of motives as the only causal reason of the moral actions of free agents. It rests on the belief, that not only does no effect take place without a cause, (as, according to the Arminian notion of free-will, volitions and things contingent are supposed to do,) but that no event comes to pass without an infinitely wise reason; which reason must include a

* Preface to the "Essais de Theodicée." tom. I. p. 299.

respect to the means, the instrument, and the moral agents concerned in it.

Now it is this knowledge of the necessary connexion between the means and the end, the cause and the effect, the motive and the action,—the knowledge, in fact, of *the true relations of things*, which Dr. Copleston imagines must lead to the destruction of all motive, and consequently of all mental activity. He does not tell us *how* this result will take place, but seems to exult in it as a wondrous metaphysical discovery, that where the doctrine of necessity or of Calvinistic predestination is firmly believed, the tendency is to destroy motive; and consequently, on that hypothesis, a continual progress in knowledge must terminate in absolute inactivity. In every point of view, the supposition is false, and the inference absurd. Push to its utmost the doctrine of metaphysical necessity, and you can never identify it with fatalism. Again, carry the knowledge of things as necessitated by their causes, or a discovery of the true relations of things according to that hypothesis, to the utmost conceivable perfection, and it can never become *foreknowledge*; to which alone, as we have shewn, the objection would apply, of its tending to destroy motive. But even foreknowledge itself has not necessarily this effect. As a perfection of Deity, it is infinitely compatible with all the active energies of the Divine nature. And there is no reason to imagine that any communications of foreknowledge of which a finite nature is susceptible, would necessarily have the effect of rendering the subject of those communications less active. Dr. Copleston, and his master, Mr. Dawson, are both chargeable with a strange oversight in arguing from the operation of certain notions on a depraved nature, to what must be the effect of the same principles in a perfect or holy nature. The conduct of the fatalist and of the antinomian in neglecting the means because the event is decreed, is nothing better than palpable folly; such folly as cannot have place in a future state where 'our faculties will be enlarged, our understandings enlightened, and our apprehensions quickened.' It is, however, something worse than folly or unreasonableness: it betrays a disinclination to the prescribed means of duty, which is incompatible with virtue. It proceeds from a diseased, if not a depraved mind, from a disordered state of the affections. If fatalism has any tendency to breed a disregard of *religious* duties, or Calvinism a disregard of *moral* duties, as Dr. Copleston ventures to affirm, it cannot be because there are no sufficient motives to the performance of those duties, but because there is a vicious disinclination to them, which overcomes the force of the proper motives. Let the nature be made good and holy, and no such result could take place. The certainty of a good has no tendency to lessen in a holy mind the desire of enjoying it; nor will the

security of the blessed in the future world destroy their inducements to holy obedience and boundless activity.

We cannot dismiss this first discourse without briefly adverting to a strangely incorrect assertion which occurs at p. 21. In proving, what we are not aware that any body has been found to deny, that the moral quality of actions depends upon the freedom of the agent, the Author says:

"So with regard to good actions, as soon as it is found that they are not spontaneous—that some secret bias or impulse made it impossible for the person to withhold the good he has done,—we even grudge the praise and admiration which his conduct may have before extorted from us."

There is a sense, we admit, in which this may hold good, if, by secret bias or impulse, the Author means a sinister or unworthy motive, which vitiates the moral quality of the good action; although how even a bad motive should render the action less spontaneous, we are at a loss to understand. But Dr. Copleston in speaking of an impulse or bias which renders it impossible for the individual to act otherwise, must mean something more than this. His words clearly imply some kind of moral necessity; and what can this be, but a bias arising from the habits or dispositions of the mind? And since it is, by the supposition, a good action which is thus necessitated, the necessitating cause must be good also. Here then we have the monstrous assertion, that in proportion as our practical principles grow stronger, and habits of virtue are formed within us, and the mind receives from the Divine Spirit a bias to holiness, which renders it impossible for him to commit sin, "because he is born of God,"—in that same proportion we become less entitled to the praise and admiration of our fellow creatures for the good actions we may render them. Good habits interfere with spontaneity! A secret bias to virtue destroys the freedom of the agent! Such is the Arminian scheme of morals. By the same rule, a confirmed thief, or drunkard, is less deserving of blame and detestation in proportion to the strength of the secret bias or impulse which governs him; and the more violent are a man's passions, the more excusable is he for indulging them. Thus, at every stage of moral inability, the sinner's demerit and his accountableness lessen, till at length, when his bias to evil becomes invincible, he stands altogether acquitted of criminality, having ceased, according to the Arminian logic, to be a free agent.

We must very briefly advert to the arguments in the following discourses. Our readers have seen with what success the Author has made good his attack upon Calvinism: in the second discourse, he undertakes, with equal advantage to his cause, to fortify his own positions. After remarking, that the conduct of

those who consult gipsies and astrologers about future events, is 'more rational than the creed of the Necessarian,'—an assertion worthy of going down to posterity along with Bishop Tomline's memorable proof that Simon Magus was a Calvinist,—Dr. Copleston proceeds to anticipate a very natural objection against his Theological notions, 'that they are inconsistent with the language habitually employed by religious men to denote their sense of the supernatural agency exerted in the world.' This objection is much more ingenuously admitted than skilfully parried. Dr. Copleston tries to throw the difficulty attaching to his own crude and baseless hypothesis, off from himself to the inscrutable nature of the subject. And he makes a most dangerous concession to the infidel, by admitting that the doctrine of God's providence is apparently incompatible with the freedom of human actions. On this point, he but echoes the sentiment of Bishop Tomline, whose words are: 'We are utterly incapable of comprehending how God's presence consists with the other attributes of the Deity and with the free agency of man.' But this imaginary difficulty was confessed long before by Descartes, who proposed the same way of getting rid of it, by replying to the objector, That we are assured of the providence of God by reason, but that we are also assured of our liberty by the internal consciousness that we are free; that we must therefore believe both propositions, though we perceive no means of reconciling them; and must not abandon ascertained truths, because we are unable to perceive their relations to other known truths. This, remarks Leibnitz, was to cut the Gordian knot, not to untie it. But then, it is a knot of the philosopher's own making. Bayle with his usual acuteness lays hold of this admission, and replies, that the alleged difficulty does not arise, as the Cartesians represent, from our want of light, but from the knowledge that we have, and with which we cannot make these doctrines agree. His object is, to overturn the argument in support of the existence of free-will, drawn from consciousness: and he attempts to dispute the spontaneity of our actions. On this Leibnitz remarks, that his sceptical reasoning reminds him of Lord Bacon's words, that a shallow draught of philosophy alienates us from God, but that those are brought back again who dive to the bottom. Dr. Copleston makes an important concession, which is directly in point. 'It is not,' he says, 'till they involve themselves in metaphysical perplexities, that men regard these things as incompatible with the acknowledged attributes of God, or with the free-will of man.'

The plain Christian will be amazed to hear that there is any difficulty in the case. The two doctrines of Divine Providence

and human freedom are, in his mind, perfectly compatible. And so they are to the Calvinist. The whole difficulty arises out of the Arminian hypothesis; and is it fair or decorous, to charge the absurdity involved in that mode of philosophising, on the inscrutability of the subject? Tucker states the supposed dilemma thus: 'An universal providence disposing all events without exception, leaves no room for freedom. But there is such a providence; therefore no freedom: or, on the other side, there is a freedom of the will, therefore no such providence. In this passage, on which Dr. Copleston bestows high praise, it is taken for granted, that the Calvinist denies the freedom of the will, in the sense of free agency;—a manifest fallacy or palpable misrepresentation, since he denies only the Arminian chimera of a freedom consisting in a certain impossible equilibrium or indifference. No Calvinist attaches any such 'meaning to the word foreknowledge, or providence, as *excludes* the notion of freedom in the will or the actions of man.' All Dr. Copleston's remarks, therefore, which assume this, fall to the ground as alike (to use his own terms) 'unreasonable' and 'arrogant.'

*Aut voluntas non est, aut libera dicenda est,** is the language of Augustine: and again, *Aguntur ut agent, non ut ipsi nihil agent.†* We know of no Calvinist who would object to either of these propositions. Only, as Edwards remarks, liberty, strictly speaking, cannot apply to the will, but rather to the agent exerting that will. For what is free choice but a person's freely choosing? The only objection to the phrase free-will, is, that it is deficient in philosophical correctness; but taken in the sense of free agency, it must at once be admitted to be essential to accountableness. Freedom is the condition of a voluntary agent, in which he has the power or the opportunity of doing what he chooses. It implies the absence of restraint or compulsion. We defy Dr. Copleston to prove that any other species of free-will is possible. How a universal providence disposing all events without exception, interferes with free agency, has never been shewn. It is by means of the free agency of man, that the "determinate counsel" and purpose of God are accomplished. It is as free agents, that the Almighty deals with us alike in the dispensations of his moral government, and in the communication of his grace, which is irresistible only because the will itself freely yields to the Divine influence. That he foresees how the creatures he has made will

* Either the will does not exist, or it must be said to be free.

† Men are acted upon that they may act, not that they may do nothing.

freely act, and that he predetermines how he will himself act towards them, and that all things will take place according to this fixed purpose, yet, neither by any necessity laid on himself, nor by any constraint laid on the creature,—this, we say, is in itself so free from incongruity, so perfectly in unison with both reason and consciousness, so consonant with the practical sense of mankind, as well as so completely the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures,—that we can conceive of no process of reasoning by which it is capable of being invalidated. We anticipate but one insurmountable objection to it, namely, that it is Calvinism.

But Dr. Copleston admits, that *his* notion of free-will is obviously incompatible, at least in appearance, with the doctrine of Divine Providence, and at war with the convictions of religious men. His own notions of Providence are, indeed, evidently obscured and perplexed by the muddy metaphysics he has embraced; since he can propose no better way of reconciling a controlling superintendence with the free agency of the creature, than by the supposition, that this controlling power 'may be kept in reserve to act upon occasions,—may form the *plan* and the *outline*, and delegate the subordinate parts to *minor agents*.' This appears to us to make Providential agency to consist, in all cases, in an *interference* with free agency: it is to substitute an occasional interposition in the place of a constant energy. It involves also the contradiction, that what is true of the whole, is not true of the subordinate parts; and that there are events exempted from the prescience of God, yet necessarily included in it. All these errors, and they are errors of no common magnitude or danger, are entailed by the supposition, that the Divine prescience, or predetermination, cannot be reconciled with the contingency of events as respects the agent, or that what is certain to God, cannot be freely brought about by man.

The Arminian notion of free-will is not, however, more incompatible with the Divine prescience, than it is with man's free agency. The indifference of equilibrium, the total freedom from bias, in which they place it, is simply, as Leibnitz has acutely remarked, 'a power to act without reason.' The being possessed of this strange prerogative cannot, it is plain, be the subject of a moral probation, since no act of his will proceeds from any thing in himself; his behaviour, therefore, neither shews what is in his heart, nor is an exercise of it. His acting right or wrong is no proof of any good or bad disposition determining his conduct, nor can any change in his character ensure the good or bad moral qualities of his future actions. Such a being is free, as a madman is free, in whose actions there must be allowed to exist the perfection of both

spontaneity and contingency, where every action is determined by an impulse disconnected with any governing bias, and the will riots in boundless and unintelligent liberty. But then, one of the necessary conditions of free agency—intelligence, being destroyed, although the will is left entire, accountableness is gone. Nevertheless, in the absolute contingency of such a man's spontaneous actions, we see nothing that excludes as incompatible with it, the most absolute foreknowledge on the part of God, or the controlling power of a Divine providence. We see only the suspension of the individual's free agency, by physical causes, of a nature entirely distinct from the moral causes which determine the actions of intelligent agents, and which are resolvable into rational motives and previous inclination.

3. We have left ourselves no room to enter at large upon the more directly theological part of the controversy. If, however, we have succeeded in exposing the fallacy of Dr. Copleston's general reasonings, we need not stay to combat their application to the doctrines of Calvinism. We must take another opportunity, also, of pointing out the very serious objections which lie against Archbishop King's hypothesis and mode of philosophising. We are glad to perceive that even the *Quarterly Reviewers** express their dissatisfaction with Dr. Copleston's reasoning, in the note to the third Discourse, which is principally taken from the Archbishop's treatise, as well as with his strange notions of Providence. Yet, they pass an encomium on the work, which will probably procure for those incorrect and dangerous notions an extensive currency. With equal inconsistency, they speak of the volume as breathing a spirit of moderation as well as of piety, while they admit that 'the doctrines of the Calvinists *only then* become a fit
' subject for reprobation, when they assert one truth to the
' utter exclusion or practical annihilation of the other; when
' they press the doctrine of predestination beyond what is necessary for the comfort and encouragement of *all* true believers, and disparage, in the hearing of those whose religion
' must be chiefly practical, the necessity (we will not say the efficacy) of a holy life.' Had this enlightened and liberal principle been adhered to by Dr. Copleston, ours would have been a far more pleasing task. But in the false and extravagant charges he has brought against the Calvinists, he appears to us to violate even the decencies of controversy; and our disappointment with the volume in this respect, is aggravated by the

* *Quarterly Review*. No. li. p. 101.

high opinion we had previously been led to entertain, of his learning, his temper, and his religious character.

There is one more point, which, on account of its practical importance, must not be passed over : we allude to the Author's views of *prayer*. Were there the least justice in his representation of the character and tendency of the Calvinistic doctrine of Providence, as bordering upon fatalism, it would be wholly inexplicable how it comes to pass, that the Calvinist lays peculiar stress on the duty of prayer, and is even prone, in Dr. C.'s view, to over-estimate its efficacy. He believes that every thing is absolutely predetermined, and yet, he prays as if nothing was determined. No attempt is made to solve this apparent contradiction, which goes, indeed, very far towards disproving the Author's whole argument. His own notions of prayer necessarily partake of the erroneousness and embarrassment which attach to his hypothesis of Providence. If the controlling power of the Almighty be ' kept in reserve ' to act upon occasions,' if it only form ' the plan and the outline,' while the subordinate parts are ' delegated to minor ' agents,'—it is unreasonable to expect that its special interference should be perpetually vouchsafed in answer to prayer, since every such interposition would be a departure from general laws. Thus, the efficacy of prayer is, according to Dr. Copleston, a very doubtful matter.

' As creatures of God,' he says, ' and acting under his superintendence, our reason informs us, that to maintain an intercourse with him, and to preserve a sense of our dependence upon him, must be a part of our business here. Prayer and meditation on his attributes are the obvious means of effecting this—and accordingly it is a universal practice, wherever any sense of religion is entertained among men. In the mode of preferring their petitions as well as in the things they pray for, a thousand differences and a thousand errors prevail : but in all cases the act itself implies a belief that the Deity is not inflexible, and that things are not absolutely so determined as to render our supplication fruitless. We suppose indeed that the government of God is carried on by general laws : and therefore prayer should always be accompanied with a disposition to acquiesce humbly in a refusal, on the ground that our petition might have interfered with the good of others or of ourselves. But that system of laws by which the world is governed, is not understood to be so fixed, as that to pray for any modification of it should be improper—nor yet, on the other hand, is it reasonable to expect that this system should bend and yield according to the particular wants of each individual.' pp. 62, 3.

Is this the blessed result of our incomparable Liturgy? Are such the notions of prayer cherished by the recital of forms? To be just, they are not less at variance with the spirit of the Liturgy, than they fall short of the doctrine of Scripture.

Prayer, as an acknowledgement of our dependence upon God, is a reasonable service ; and its practical influence illustrates the Divine wisdom in authorising such a means of intercourse with himself. But on neither of these grounds is the duty of Prayer enforced in the Scriptures. In them, we are every where taught to entertain a firm persuasion of its positive efficiency, as the appointed means of our obtaining the blessings we ask for. Nothing can be more unequivocal than the language of our Saviour on this head, or, if Dr. Copleston be right,—we speak it with reverence—more calculated to mislead. We admit, that we have no warrant in the Scriptures for expecting, that the system of the universe should bend and yield according to our particular wants ; that is, that our wants should be supplied by miracle ; nor is this what any Calvinist, how ‘ ignorant ’ or ‘ sanguine ’ soever, expects. We admit, that with regard to all *temporal* things, our prayers should correspond to the conditional nature of God’s promises, which are the law of our prayers ; and that a disposition to acquiesce in the Divine wisdom, is essential to the intelligent and acceptable performance of the duty. But Dr. Copleston forgets, that the chief end of prayer is, to obtain communications of a spiritual nature, which, as being absolutely promised, we are taught absolutely to ask for, and which cannot possibly interfere with the good of others. And if prayer be not an efficient means of our obtaining these blessings, it is impossible that our prayers should be what the Scriptures term the prayer of faith. This, however, although its chief end, is not its only purpose. We are taught, as the sovereign antidote against worldly carefulness, “ in every thing by prayer and supplication “ with thanksgiving, to make known our requests unto God ; “ casting all our care upon him, because he careth for us.” Would it afford the Christian any adequate motive to a compliance with this exhortation, to believe that there is ‘ a controlling power kept in reserve to act upon occasions,’ which, nevertheless, he must not expect to be interposed, to the disturbance of general laws, for his particular accommodation ? Will it yield him any encouragement under his trials, to be told that ‘ the Deity is *not inflexible* ?’ Miserable philosophers ! Miserable, still more miserable comforters ! Behold the genuine results of the anti-Calvinistic theology—the creed of the Pelagian grafted on the philosophy of the Stoic !

But does the Calvinist expect that his prayers are to effect any ‘ modification ’ of the system of general laws by which the universe is governed ? Assuredly not. It is enough for him to know, that the efficacy of prayer is itself one of those general laws ; and that, how absolute soever the predetermination of

events, that predetermination cannot possibly exclude the manifestation of individual character, the means which God has himself connected with moral ends, or the performance of his own promises. 'It is not till they involve themselves in metaphysical perplexities, that men regard these things as incompatible.'

Predestination and Election, then, it is sufficiently plain, are subjects too intimately connected with other revealed truths, and are of too great practical importance in themselves, to be abandoned to the metaphysician. The 'godly consideration' of them is 'full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort;' nor are they attended with either difficulty or danger to any besides 'the curious and the carnal.' A predestination to eternal life of all who embrace Christ, an election which excludes none but the self-excluded—that is, the unbelieving and the impenitent, how awful soever its bearings on the ungodly, is fraught only with consolation to the real Christian. A liability to abuse is common to all the doctrines of the Gospel. But as to the supposed horrors peculiar to this feature of the Christian system, in relation to those who reject the interposition of the Redeemer, it deserves the serious consideration of every pious mind, whether any metaphysical attempts to mitigate those horrors by representing *their* condition as less desperately perilous, be not the reverse of benevolent, as tending to weaken or counteract the emphatic warnings of Scripture. Where the Devil thrusts one sinner into desperation, a hundred perish through presumption.

By no class of preachers is the Scriptural exhortation to "flee from the wrath to come," more earnestly reiterated than by the believers in Calvinistic Predestination. Dr. Copleston, if he knows any thing of their practice, cannot deny this fact. But he contends, that 'the natural tendency of Calvinistic opinions to breed a carelessness with regard to *moral conduct*, 'not only appears demonstrable by fair reasoning, but is confirmed also by historic testimony.' As to his reasoning, our readers are by this time satisfied that it is perfectly harmless; but we must say one word as to historic testimony. We were pained and disgusted to see the thread-bare anecdote of the Landgrave of Turing again cited by any respectable writer, with Heylin's illiberal comment. Mr. Scott, in his Answer to Tomline, had, we thought, sufficiently exposed the licentious quibble which is ascribed to the Landgrave. It is quite true, that if I am predestinated to eternal life, no sins of mine shall deprive me of the kingdom of heaven; because the sign of my predestination will be, my being delivered from the power of sin, and undergoing a holy change of character. This is the

answer which Heylin professed he had sought for in vain. But the attempt to fasten the extravagancies of the besotted Antinomian on the Calvinistic doctrine, is the last dishonest resource of a defeated opponent. We wish that a writer so respectable as Dr. Copleston had kept quite clear of this proceeding. Nothing can be more complete than the historical testimony in favour of the practical tendency of the Calvinistic opinions. On the one side, among those who have held those opinions, we have the soundest and most virtuous part of the Romish community, the Jansenists; we have the Puritans, whose strictness of morals has never been questioned; we have the Calvinists of Holland, Switzerland, and France; and we have, above all, the Calvinistic Presbyterians of Scotland. On the other side, range the Jesuits; the Remonstrants of Holland, many of whom, even Mosheim allows, were as lax in their morals, as heterodox in their creed; and, since the accession of Charles II., the majority of the English clergy. Foremost among the virulent impugnors of Calvinism have always appeared the philosophic infidel and the Socinian on the one hand, and the High-church Pelagian divine on the other; and the invectives of Bishop Tomline against the Calvinists, are but the echo of the attacks which the French Encyclopedists levelled against the African Monk and the Geneva Reformer.

In conclusion, we beg leave to express our cordial satisfaction with the view of the subject exhibited in the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England. As Dissenters from the Established Church, we can be under no temptation to profess our approbation of that Article, if it did not speak our real sentiments. But if Dr. Copleston should suspect that we are at all singular in our opinion, we must remind him, that the period is not very remote at which all Protestant Dissenting Ministers were required to subscribe this very Article, while they were allowed to express their dissent from three and a half of the Thirty-nine. And even now, without charging upon the Arminian clergy a disbelief of the Seventeenth Article as *they* understand it, (although numbers are known to subscribe with that mental reserve for which Paley contends as justifiable,) we are fully persuaded, that more persons would be found out of the Establishment, than in it, who heartily approve of its phraseology. Dr. Copleston himself, as well as Dr. Laurence, seems to admire it for what it does not express, rather than for what it does, and to be more satisfied that it goes no further, than pleased that it goes so far. We are satisfied with it in both respects. We freely confess that a great deal has been rashly and crudely said

about the Divine Decrees, which we wholly disapprove. Against Calvin's own sentiments, except on the subject of Reprobation, we have not much to object, beyond an unguardedness of statement which has laid him open to misrepresentation. But there are writers who have been aptly designated as *Calvino Calviniores*, whose peremptory assertions on these subjects we deprecate as warmly as our Author would. Mr. Vaughan is the latest of these shallow and pernicious speculators; and he has ventured much further than we could have supposed a pious man, however deluded by his own false reasonings, would have done. Between the two assertions, that God's purpose is founded on his foreknowledge, and, that his foreknowledge is founded on his purpose, or, as Calvin states it, *Ideò præscivit, quia decreto suo sic ordinavit*,—we see little to choose: both appear to us alike unmeaning and unphilosophical. Calvin had in view, to oppose the Romish doctrine of a Predestination caused by foreseen good works in man; a doctrine which Luther not less warmly combated. But the opposite of error is not always truth. Both propositions undertake to assign a cause for the Divine proceeding, which they entirely fail to supply. The *Because* lies neither in the attribute of prescience, nor in the act of predetermination; since neither can the attribute supply the reason of the act, nor the act be the reason of the existence of the attribute. And when a specific exercise of the Divine attribute, and an act of the Divine will in reference to the same objects, are spoken of, the attempt to distinguish between them in the order of time, is utterly fallacious and absurd. Again, to assign a reason or motive for the determination of the Creator, *exterior to himself*, involves a contradiction. On these inscrutable subjects, truth itself sounds like impropriety. But the only reason that can be given for the Divine decrees, is, that, out of all possible worlds or systems of creation, the one which exists, as the fruit of the Divine predetermination, is the best. As to the rest, the resolution of Augustine is the wisest, *Alii disputent, ego mirabor*.

-
- Art. II. 1. *Cain, a Mystery*. By Lord Byron. 12mo. London. 1822.
 2. *The Vision of Judgement: a Poem*. By Robert Southey, Esq. LL. D. Poet Laureate, &c. 4to. London. 1821.

OUR reluctance to occupy our pages with publications of this description, has led us hitherto to content ourselves with a mere passing reference to the still-born hexameters of Mr. Southey, and the abortive tragedies of his noble rival. Nor should we have departed from our original intention to pass them over, had not one of these publications acquired an

unfortunate notoriety, having found its way, in a cheap form, into an extended circulation, owing less to its literary merit, than to its moral demerits as a choice importation of daring impiety for the lowest of the vulgarly profane to batten on. It is on the character and tendency of both publications, in a moral view, that we wish to offer a few remarks.

To impute motives to any writer, is seldom justifiable; and yet, it is impossible that the motives of the Author of *Cain*, in sending forth that publication, could be good. To charge him with a deliberate love of mischief for its own sake, with a Satanic desire to proselyte to infidelity, is, we think, going further than is warranted by either propriety or probability. But we cannot help suspecting that his Lordship was disposed to put the liberty of the press in this country, in reference to irreligious works, to a fair trial; that seeing how Hone tortured Lord Ellenborough, and how Carlile, by his besotted obstinacy, is giving a moment's consequence to the Bridge-street jobbers, he wished to put to the test the efficiency of the law, and the validity of the principles on which some recent prosecutions have been conducted. For this purpose, he seems here to have thrown down the gauntlet to Mr. Attorney General; and we can easily imagine that he laughs in his sleeve at the silent consternation produced by his challenge; that he secretly enjoyed the solemn perplexity of the Lord Chancellor, when the application for an injunction against the pirated edition came before the Court, and when *Cain* was gravely paralleled with *Paradise Lost*; and that, most of all, he laughs at the awkward situation in which he has placed the Poet Laureat, as at once his rebuker and his fellow culprit. A malignant pleasure of this kind, whether it entered into his Lordship's motives or not, we think very consonant with what he has been pleased to let us know of his character; and if it can repay him for the irretrievable infamy which, as the Author of *Don Juan* and *Cain*, he has purchased, who would envy him the utmost gratification he can derive from his diabolical joke?

"*Cain*" is not, however, a *profane* poem: the "*Vision of Judgement*" is. This assertion will stagger those only who do not consider what is the import of the word. Profaneness is an irreverent use of sacred names and things. Now a religious drama or mystery, founded on the Scripture narrative, is, in itself, no profanation of any thing sacred. *Paradise Lost*, *The Messiah*, *The World before the Flood*, Racine's tragedies of *Esther* and *Athaliah*, are all precedents so far in point. Of this, Lord Byron was fully aware; and here, in a Court of Law, would rest his defence. He pleads, that he has not even taken the same liberties with his subject that were

common formerly, 'as may be seen,' he says, 'by any reader 'curious enough to refer to those *very profane productions*, (the "Mysteries or Moralities") 'whether in English, French, 'Italian, or Spanish.' But a burlesque of things sacred, whether intentional or not, is profaneness. To apply the language of Scripture in a ludicrous connexion, is to profane it. The mimicry of prayer on the Stage, though in a serious play, is a gross profanation of sacred things. And all acts which come under the taking of God's name in vain, are acts of profaneness. According to this definition of the word, the Vision of Judgement is a poem grossly and unpardonably profane. Mr. Southey's intention was, we are well persuaded, very far from being irreligious; and indeed, the profaneness of the poem partly arises from the ludicrous effect produced by the bad taste and imbecility of the performance, for which his intentions are clearly not answerable. Still, the Author cannot be exonerated. Whatever liberties a poet may claim to take, in representations purely allegorical, with the invisible realities of the world to come, the ignis fatuus of political zeal has in this poem carried Mr. Southey far beyond any assignable bounds of poetical license. It would have been enough to celebrate the apotheosis of the monarch; but, when he proceeds to travestie the final judgement, and to convert the awful tribunal of Heaven into a drawing room levee, where he, the Poet Laureate, takes upon himself to play the part of a lord in waiting, presenting one Georgian worthy after another, to kiss hands on promotion,—what should be grave is, indeed, turned to farce.

It is possible, since Lord Byron's *Cain* has been mentioned along with *Paradise Lost*, that Robert Southey might plead the precedent of Dante, who, in his *Divina Commedia*, has been very free in distributing eternal rewards and punishments to his countrymen and contemporaries, according to his private feelings and political partialities. Between Southey and Dante, the intellectual distance is not so great as the moral distance between Milton and Lord Byron. The parallel in either case is about as close. The time at which Dante wrote, not less than the character and spirit of his poem, rescues it, at least to our feelings, from the charge of profaneness; since, in his wildest fictions, he did but tread in the steps of the monkish fabulists, and in many instances he only adopted the current superstitions of the popular creed. Yet, no one will contend for the abstract propriety of Dante's machinery, or vindicate the use which in every instance he has made of it. The incongruities, the barbarous taste, the occasional imbecilities which disfigure his great poem, would have been fatal to a production of less transcendent merit. And what, in a

Roman Catholic of the thirteenth century is imputable to the barbarism of superstition, would, in a Protestant of the nineteenth century, be sheer profaneness and gross impropriety.

Besides, as irreverence essentially enters into the idea of profaneness, the apparent purpose of the writer must be considered as greatly mitigating or otherwise aggravating his offence. When sacred names or things are introduced into a work of fiction, the design of which is noble or meritorious, the argument lofty, and the general tendency good, one is ready to overlook the misapplication; in some instances, to admire its beauty. But when the object is low and unworthy, and the tendency exceptionable, one feels as if the offence were greater. Profaneness is certainly more intolerable, if not more criminal, in proportion to its vulgarity. Now there is much in the *Vision of Judgement* that is positively vulgar—vulgar in the conception, vulgar in the political feeling which inspired it, vulgar in the bungling machinery, the stage clouds and canvas heavens of the performance, vulgar in the Laureate's hired and fulsome loyalty. And it is this which makes the profaneness of his hexameters more offensive than that which pervades his *Kehama*, and disfigures his *Roderick*.

Profaneness is a crime, unhappily, not confined to persons destitute of religion. The profane *jeux de mots* and the illicit use of Scripture phraseology in which the ministers of religion are too apt to indulge, will at once occur to our readers in verification of this remark. In Mr. Southey, we are disposed to impute it to his being, from the peculiar habits of his mind, unsusceptible of the feeling of moral propriety or impropriety in relation to the objects of religious reverence. It is not a little remarkable, that a writer so exemplarily free from all that borders on impurity of thought or expression, who discovers so much delicacy as well as amiableness of sentiment, and so nice a sense of practical propriety in all matters of costume or personification, should have so perpetually and grossly sinned against religious taste. His accommodations of Scripture language in the *Kehama*, e. g. the speech of Ereenia to Kailyal,—

‘ Be of good heart, beloved. It is I
Who bear thee’——

are utterly inconsistent with a proper reverence for Divine truth. We readily believe that Mr. Southey does not mean to be profane, because we believe that he does not know when he is profane. His religious sense has, we suspect, become blunted by the prostitution of his heart to the idols of his fancy. He has, in his poems, played the part of a devout believer in every faith but that of Judaism; has invoked in turn Mahommed,

the Virgin, and the monsters of the Hindoo pantheon, with well-feigned zeal and fervour; and it is hardly to be expected that he should have come out of all these transmigrations without retaining in his character some traces of his pre-existent conditions. As the Biographer of the Cid, of Lord Nelson, and of Wesley, he has undergone scarcely less strange mutations; for the religion of his heroes differed almost as widely as that of Thalaba does from that of Ladurlad or of Roderick. The result of all this, it is easy to conceive, must be the deadening of the religious sensibilities. 'Punch,' said Johnson to Garrick, 'Punch, David, does not feel.' If actors felt, they could not be actors. Now Mr. Southey, in the poems alluded to, acts so well the Mahommedan, the Heathen, and the Papist, that we are constrained to believe that religion is a subject on which he does not feel. And this deficiency of feeling betrays him unwittingly into profaneness. Sacred things are so strangely jumbled in his mind with the figments of imagination, the lumber of learning, the legends of former ages, the politics of the day, things real and unreal, clean and unclean, a heterogeneous *omnia*, that nothing is less surprising than that they should get shuffled, as it were, so as to produce a sort of cross readings, in which Scripture is grafted on the Vedas, poetry runs into politics, loyalty into profaneness, and heaven is let down into Carlton palace.

That Mr. Southey is not conscious of the gross profaneness with which, in his hapless *Vision*, he is so pre-eminently chargeable, is manifest from the high and indignant tone which he assumes as a moralist, in applying the branding iron (as he facetiously terms the art of nicknaming) to Lord Byron, and in calling down the vengeance of the Civil Power on what he designates as the Satanic school. But really, while we would not place his Lordship and Mr. Southey on a-par in respect to intention, we do not see upon what principle the one can be subjected to pains and penalties, and the other escape. If profaneness is indictable, the *Vision of Judgement* is an offence which would deserve not less than *Cain* itself, to be sent to a jury; and the absence of bad intention could be pleaded only in mitigation.

If Lord Byron is not, strictly speaking, guilty of profaneness in his poem, it does not, assuredly, proceed from any reverence of sacred subjects. But profaneness would not comport with the character of the poem: it would have been in bad taste, would not have suited his purpose. Lord Byron is a man of exquisite taste, of cool science; and in this respect he has an immense advantage over his opponent, even when they fairly strip to abuse one another. In *Don Juan* he is most atrociously

and satanically profane ; but, in that execrable poem, the profaneness is in keeping with all the other qualities, and religion comes in for a sneer, a burlesque, or a burst of blasphemy, only in common with every thing that is dear or valuable to us as moral and social beings. The essential profaneness of Lord Byron's feelings, is betrayed in the preface to this poem, where he says, with the grin of sarcasm :

‘ With regard to the language of Lucifer, it was difficult for me to make him talk like a clergyman upon the same subjects ; but I have done what I could to restrain him within the bounds of spiritual politeness.’

But it is not on the score of profaneness, that Cain can be brought under the cognizance of any criminal court. Unless the charge of an overt act of blasphemy could be brought home to the Author, it is neither suspected evil design, nor pernicious tendency, which could justify the interference of the civil magistrate. And this overt act must include blasphemous intention on the part of the Writer ; since, in *Paradise Lost*, Satan is certainly made to blaspheme, although two opinions cannot exist with regard to the perfect innoxiousness of those passages, any more than respecting the religious tendency of the poem as a whole. It would, in our judgement, be very difficult to bring home blasphemous intention to the Author of *Cain*, although we cannot conceive of its having originated in any other source than the most hardened and callous impiety. Impiety is not an overt act : it cannot be laid hold of by human laws. It is too subtle, too intangible, too all pervading a principle to deal with, by any carnal weapons. One of the most impious works that ever issued from an English writer, is Gibbon's *Roman History* ; yet, it is free from blasphemy, and is seldom profane. One of the profanest books in our language is the *Spiritual Quixote*, the production of a clergyman ; yet, few persons would pronounce it impious. A blasphemer is generally either a fool or a madman. If Tom Paine is an exception, he is likely to remain a solitary one. The infidel is too crafty, for the most part too unimpassioned, to indulge in blasphemy. Some of the Unitarian writers of the present day have ventured the nearest to direct and positive blasphemy, of any class of the community ; and they are blasphemers of by far the most dangerous description. Yet, blasphemous intention could not be with truth imputed to them ; nor would any wise man, not to say any pious man, wish to see the brute argument of power employed to silence them. We are not allowed to call down fire from heaven, and we should do ill to call it up from beneath. We may not employ the sword of Peter, any more than that of Mahommed,

even in defence of our Divine Master. He has committed to us the sword of the Spirit, and retains the sword of vengeance in his own hand.

After all, "*Cain*" does not come up in licentious wickedness to "*Don Juan*:" it is at least free from obscenity, which, as regards the interests of society, is, perhaps, worse than direct blasphemy. On this point we agree with Mr. Southey, that 'the publication of a lascivious book is one of the worst offences that can be committed against society; a sin to the consequences of which no limits can be assigned.' Of this sin, it is to Mr. Southey's honour, that he stands so clear. But lasciviousness is generally a concomitant of infidelity in its most virulent forms. In the French Encyclopedists, in the wits of the reign of Charles II., in Smollett and Gibbon, in Leigh Hunt and Lord Byron, this morbid love of impurity is strikingly manifested in alliance with impiety. In this brutalizing tendency of infidelity, there is something of a judicial visitation. "Professing themselves to be wise," says St. Paul, speaking of the old heathen infidels, "they became fools; wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness."

But the impiety chargeable on this *Mystery*, consists mainly in this; that the purposeless and gratuitous blasphemies put into the mouth of Lucifer and Cain, are left unrefuted, so that they appear introduced for their own sake, and the design of the Writer seems to terminate in them. There is no attempt made to prevent their leaving the strongest possible impression on the reader's mind. On the contrary, the arguments, if such they can be called, levelled against the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, are put forth with the utmost ingenuity. And it has been his Lordship's endeavour, to palliate as much as possible the characters of the Evil Spirit and of the first murderer; the former of whom is made an elegant, poetical, philosophical sentimentalist, a sort of Manfred; the latter an ignorant, proud, and self-willed boy. Lucifer, too, is represented as denying all share in the temptation of Eve, which he throws upon the serpent 'in his serpentine capacity;' the Author pleading that he does so 'only because the book of Genesis has not the most distant allusion to any thing of the kind,' and that a reference to the New Testament 'would be an *anachronism*.' It is not necessary to combat this monstrous absurdity with a serious argument. Lord Byron disbelieves the whole Scripture narrative: otherwise, he would not for a moment have adopted a supposition which renders the import of the prediction, Gen. iii. 15, almost unmeaning, and contradicts the plainest declarations of Scripture relative to the agency of the Tempter. There would be consistency, indeed,

in making Satan a liar; but such was not the Author's intention: the lie is, therefore, his own, and the whole drama is a lie,—a deliberate falsification of the truth. All fiction is in a certain sense literally untrue; but this is a fiction morally untrue, a perversion of fact intended to deceive. The sophistry of Lucifer is indeed couched in 'serpent's words.' We purposely refrain from extracts, but content ourselves with giving one expression from the long diabolical conference between Lucifer and his pupil, where the Poet makes the Evil Spirit ask,

' Did I plant things prohibited within
The reach of beings innocent, and curious
By their own innocence?'

A more deadly sentiment, a more insidious falsehood than is conveyed in these words, could not be injected into the youthful mind by the Author of Evil. Innocence is *not* the cause of curiosity, but has in every stage of society been its victim. Curiosity, and Lord Byron knows it, has ruined greater numbers than any other passion; and as, in its incipient actings, it is the most dangerous foe of innocence, so, when it becomes a passion, it is only fed by guilt. Innocence, indeed, is gone, when desire has conceived the sin. Cain, in this drama, is made, like the Faust of Goëthe, to be the victim of curiosity; and a fine moral might have been deduced from it. There are passages which seem inserted on purpose to shew how wilfully the drama is made what it is. Lucifer promises to teach Cain all knowledge on one condition, that he will fall down and worship him. Cain answers that he has never bowed to his Father's God. The Spirit replies:

' He who bows not to him, has bow'd to me!

' *Cain.* But I will bend to neither.

' *Lucifer.* Ne'er the less,
Thou art my worshipper: not worshipping
Him, makes thee mine the same.'

This is finely said, and there are other passages which one could wish to retrieve from the rest of the poem. But these are but gleams which shew the horrors of the surrounding darkness. The Poet asserts again and again the prevalence and triumph of Evil; he imagines its having extended to former worlds; he seems to exult in the idea of its universal diffusion, as rolling on for ever,

' A part of all things.'

He goes further than even the Manichean mystics. He virtually

denies the notion of an essentially Good and an essentially Evil Principle, and, in the person of Lucifer, argues from the existence of Evil, against the benevolence of God. By this means, he prepares Cain, in the subsequent scene, to become a fratricide; and he would fain beguile the reader into sympathy with him, as less a criminal than a victim. For all this, he might plead high Pagan precedents. To the old Grecian muse, this was the highest flight attainable,—to soar above the vulgarities of Olympus, into the unfathomable darkness of metaphysical atheism, and there to shape to herself a blind, inert, implacable phantom deity under the name of Necessity or Fate. Lord Byron, it may be said, has but attributed to their right author, the stale impieties of the old atheists. He has but put into the Devil's mouth the bewildering question, *Si Deus est, unde malum?* making poetry the organ of the dark and barren metaphysics of Bayle and Spinoza. But then he has done this in a manner which shews that he sides with the enemies of human happiness, and with the arch enemy who inspires and leads them on. He has summoned both fiction and falsehood to aggravate the philosophical difficulties which he, in this poem, has laboured to embalm in verse; difficulties new to a large proportion of his readers, and with which the young and inexperienced are ill able to grapple. These, this new apostle of infidelity has endeavoured to propagate in a shape the most adapted to make an impression on the imagination. In the very spirit of the fabled Sphinx, he propounds these dark enigmas, that those who fail to unravel them, may perish.

That this is a heinous offence against society, who will dare deny? It is an offence of the deepest dye. Unhappily, it is not a solitary instance. The case of Lawrence the anatomical lecturer and preacher of materialism, is still more aggravated than that of the Author of *Cain*. But whether such men can be dealt with by the State as criminals, on any valid and equitable principle of jurisprudence, appears to us extremely doubtful. Even, if such proceedings could be maintained, the policy of instituting them is questionable. But on this subject we have already expressed our opinions, from which, on the maturest consideration, we see no reason to swerve. We have endeavoured in this article to point out the broad distinction between two things which are often confounded—simple profaneness and blasphemous impiety. This distinction was strikingly illustrated in the cases of Hone and Carlile. Hone's parodies were grossly profane: they were not blasphemous. There was no proof that it entered into his intention to degrade religion. Carlile's offence was levelled against Christianity itself. The same difference exists in the cases before us. Sou-

they, like Hone, is only profane : Lord Byron, like Carlyle, is a blasphemer. But, in whatever way the Law may deal with these offenders, we console ourselves in thinking, that as Christianity does not authorize, so, she does not stand in need of the aid of pains and penalties inflicted on her deluded assailants. Religion has nothing to fear from the puny efforts of such men. She has in every age suffered more from her injudicious friends and blundering advocates, than from her most formidable antagonists.

Art. III. *Report of the Committee managing a Fund raised by some Friends, for the Purpose of promoting African Instruction ; with an Account of a Visit to the Gambia and Sierra Leone.* 8vo. pp. 72. London. 1822.

WE have been much interested by this Report of a Quaker Missionary experiment. In the cause of suffering humanity, the members of the Society of Friends have on many occasions evinced a Missionary zeal ; and no denomination of Christians has furnished more illustrious philanthropists. To individuals of this estimable body, the cause of general education all over the world is very greatly indebted ; while at home their members generally have distinguished themselves in promoting the circulation of the Bible. All these circumstances go to prove that there is a vitality in Quakerism, that the spirit of Penn is not extinct in their body, and that if hitherto they have not contributed their share to the sum of exertion put forth by the several denominations of Christians for promoting the evangelization of the heathen, it has not arisen from a deficiency of zeal, or at least not from any want of benevolence.

The doctrinal peculiarities of their religious system, have doubtless had the effect of deterring them from the direct method resorted to by Christian missionaries in general for promulgating the Gospel. We allude more especially to their views of the ministry and of preaching. But even if, on these and some other points, they are withheld from co-operating with the members of other religious bodies, still, in the formation of schools, in the distribution of the Bible, and in all the means of civilization,—branches of Missionary exertion scarcely inferior in importance to direct religious teaching,—there is nothing, we apprehend, to prevent their actively concurring with others, or taking the lead themselves in new directions. Prejudices against Missionary exertions far more obstinate and malignant than any for which Quakerism may be answerable, have given way, in other directions, before the progress of enlightened views of the kingdom of Christ. Let a sect fence itself round as it may, it cannot keep out the all-

modifying influence of increasing information and the spirit of the times : these will break in upon every sectarian enclosure, and at length find their level. We consider the exertions made by the Society of Friends in connexion with the Bible Society, as a signal and honourable concession on their part to the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism, the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith. And we are disposed to view it also in the light of a solemn pledge to future co-operation in the common cause of Christianity. Of this we are fully persuaded, that, in proportion as the influences of the Holy Spirit, on whose teaching and agency their tenets more especially lead them to rely, are poured down on any individuals or on any community, they will inspire a zeal for the conversion of the Heathen and for the extension of the knowledge of Christ. This zeal may shew itself in an individual, we admit, without being accompanied with other necessary evidences of true piety. But in application to collective bodies of Christians, the criterion is a safe one ; and we should view the absence of such a spirit in the present day, in any sect or denomination, as a sure prognostic of its approaching decline and extinction. As Friends, therefore, value their own tenets, as they would be thought sincere in their attachment to them, as they value the Bible as a means or outward word, and as they honour the True Word and the Spirit of Truth,—on the principle of self-preservation as a body, and on the higher principles of faith and obedience as Christians,—it behooves them to see to it that they do not come behind others in the great work of evangelizing the world that lieth in the wicked one.

The undertaking to which this Report relates, originated in the benevolent views of a female individual. The subject was brought forward in London before the Society, in 1819, by Hannah Kilham of Sheffield, ‘ whose mind,’ we are told, ‘ had been for some years under an impression of duty to employ her talents in this way, for the benefit of these untutored members of the human family.’ Her views extended not merely to the personal instruction of some young Africans, whom she took under her superintendence as pupils, but ‘ to the forming of an Institution for cultivating some of the unwritten languages of Africa ; for reducing them to grammatical principles, composing elementary books, translating portions of the Scriptures, and diffusing them, by the instrumentality of the natives, and through the medium of school teaching, among their countrymen.’ In this plan, our readers will recognise the outlines of a system coming as nearly as possible to that on which our missionaries are proceeding in different parts of the world, except that it does not

embrace a provision for administering Christian ordinances. A subscription being set on foot for these purposes, some friends agreed to act as a committee for carrying forward the design, whose names are a sufficient pledge to the public* as to the beneficent character and prudent management of the undertaking.

The two youths selected by Hannah Kilham for education, are named Sandanee and Mahmadee : the former is from Goree, the latter from the banks of the Gambia, and both of them speak the Jaloof or Waloof language, in which their benevolent instructress has herself become, by continued application, a considerable proficient. These pupils have conducted themselves with propriety and diligence; and they manifest qualities of mind, in respect both of talent and disposition, which encourage the prospect of their amply repaying the labour and pains bestowed on them. 'The still more important result, of a degree of religious susceptibility, is,' the Committee state, 'apparent in both.' Two specimens of Scripture passages, rendered by them from English into Jaloof, are given in illustration of the progress they have already made. The practicability of reducing the language to writing, as well as the general solidity of the principles adopted by Hannah Kilham in her labours, has been decidedly pronounced upon by a person of colour, a native of Senegal, well skilled in the Jaloof and Foulah tongues, and acquainted also with English, French, and Arabic.

In pursuance of the general object of opening a direct intercourse with the natives, the Committee availed themselves of the offer of William Singleton of Loxley near Sheffield, to proceed to Africa, to visit the chiefs of the Jaloof nation, and to engage, if he could obtain the consent of all parties, two more pupils of that nation. He was to collect information on the state of the country, the natives, and the language, and to return by way of Sierra Leone, in order to have a view of the improvements going on at that settlement. His Report to the Committee, together with extracts from his Journal, occupies the chief part of the present publication; and though the additional information it contains, is not very considerable, yet, the narrative is highly interesting, and the way has been cleared by this expedition for further proceedings. We are not informed what directed Mrs. Kilham's attention to the Jaloof language in preference to other African dialects. Mr. Sin-

* The Committee consists of William Allen, Peter Bedford, Edward Carroll, Robert Forster, Luke Howard, Thomas Newman, Evan Rees, and John Sanderson.

gleton was strongly recommended by a merchant in the island of St. Mary, to cultivate the Mandingo, as being much more extensively spoken. The Waloofs,* he was told, are a domestic people, little known beyond their own territories; while the Mandingoes not only inhabit a greater extent of country, but travel much as traders, by which means their language has become much more generally known. Not being able to obtain at Bathurst an interpreter and guide, Mr. S. was obliged to abandon the design of exploring the Jaloof country. He made two excursions up the Gambia, and went to Mandinari, a few miles South of Bathurst, 'to see the land which had been given to the Wesleyan missionaries by the king of 'Combo,' with whom he had a palaver at Yindum, the place of his residence. He considers the town of Bakkàoo on the Cape St. Mary, which belongs to this chief, as a very eligible place for the proposed settlement on the Gambia. From the Journal we select a few further particulars.

'The island called St. Mary's is an irregular shaped sand-bank, very little elevated above the river. It is nearly level; and in digging, nothing but sand, not a stone can be found. The houses are built of stone from the Barra coast. In its greatest length, the island is nearly four miles east and west: the widest part about one mile and a half. Its situation is on the chart, Banyan Point N. lat. 13. 20'. W. lon. 17° 34'.

'The town of Bathurst stands on the east end of the island, which is by far the narrowest part, and, in the rainy season, is nearly overflowed with water; yet, notwithstanding the unfavourable situation of the town, measures might be adopted, which would considerably improve its condition. The colony is in its infancy. The settlers have done, and are doing much; and have in contemplation more for the general benefit. The buildings erected, and being erected, by government, are considerable.

'The first object that engaged my attention as I passed along the beach, was the great variety in the countenances and forms of the natives. Some appeared to possess so little of the human face, so little indication of intellect, that, at the first glance, I was rather painfully affected: in others, there was nothing remarkable. In some, the character seemed to be improved: their features convinced me they had mind; and in those of one individual especially, were strikingly apparent both ability and nobility.

'This difference in the forms, &c. of the Africans, I have since observed, is, in part, national. Generally, the Jaloof is rather tall, plump, of fine turned limbs, short curling hair, and shining jet black skin. The

* Mr. Singleton states in his journal, that 'the country is called 'Jaloof; (Jol-uf;) the inhabitants Waloofs; and the language Waloof.' Also, that the pure Waloof is spoken only in Jaloof and Cayor. Mr. Mollien, however, calls both the country and its inhabitants *Joloff*. We suspect that the distinction is imaginary, or arbitrary.

Mandingoes, mostly of a spare make, not quite so clean, or of so bright a black; their hair somewhat less curled than that of the Jaloofs. But the Kroomen are the most remarkable. Though they are of different heights, all that I have seen are remarkable for their upright walk, firm tread, activity, and strength of muscle. They abound in Sierra Leone, where they are employed as cooks, grooms, or labourers. The Pul, or Foolah, is as filthy as the Jaloof is clean. He wears his hair long, platted into a hundred divisions, and as full of grease as it can contain. His skin appears as if sullied with dirt, rather than naturally black; and in his person he is somewhat like the Mandingo.

‘Respecting the interior of the Jaloof country, J. Billyaud states: the soil is mostly sandy, yet fruitful; that there are no high mountains; but that, taking the course from Senegal to the eastward, where the principal king of the Jaloofs resides, if a judgement may be formed from the gradually increasing depths of the wells, it is one continued rise: the distance, three or four days’ journey. At Senegal, the wells are in depth about twenty fathoms: at Worko, the king’s town, upwards of one hundred. There, when a well is to be sunk, a whole village or more are employed; and as the natives are not acquainted with the practice of walling, and the soil is loose, they are obliged to make the well exceedingly wide: this increases the labour, and protracts it to many months. During the operation, it seldom fails that several lives are lost, by the falling in of the sides of the well. They are also ignorant of the use of the windlass; and have no means of drawing up the rubbish but by hand, with a cord and a calabash, or such like vessel. By this mode they draw water, which renders the labour so oppressive, that successive companies of men are obliged to relieve each other: they are employed constantly; and, if a stranger would partake of the fruit of their labour, he must pay for the refreshment.

‘In crossing the country, camels and horses are sometimes used; but the natives mostly travel on foot. Thus Mahmadee Grant, the courier, passed regularly between Senegal and Goree, with a speed which Europeans have failed to equal on horses. And thus the natives called gold-merchants, mostly Mandingoes, traverse the country, from the Gambia to parts beyond Sego, to collect the gold found in different places, in order to exchange it for the various articles of trade sold in Bathurst, principally beads, which they barter for the gold. But so careful are they in trading, or bartering their gold with the merchants, that they frequently sit at the stores a whole day, before they will strike a bargain. To this mode of holding intercourse with the natives, may be added that of the Gambia merchants sending vessels up that river, to trade at the villages on its banks.

‘In each village, one native, called the lodging-man, finds accommodation for native traders coming from a distance with their wax, hides, and other articles, to barter with the Europeans; and acts as interpreter and daysman, if necessary, between the two parties; for which services he receives a compensation from them both.’

Between the Jaloofs and the Mandingoes, there appears to be a strong mutual antipathy. The former are said to be

dreaded by other nations on account of their expertness in war, in which they employ much cavalry. Their disposition, according to one account, is affectionate, mild, peaceable, and patient; while the captain of the vessel in which Mr. S. explored the banks of the Gambia, represented them as jealous, giving little attention to trade, and great thieves. The latter characteristic would seem equally to belong to the Mandingoes, who are stated to depend for support chiefly on theft and the slave-trade; yet, they have cultivated enclosures, are therefore to some extent agricultural, and carry on a trade by purchasing wax, hides, &c. from the Feloops, an industrious nation further inland. Except among the *Sereens*, as the Mahomedans are called, and their followers, there is not any place or form of worship among the Mandingoes; nor have they, according to the information of a native interpreter, any idols or images.

‘Should any native determine to leave the evil practices of the *So-nink-as* (pagans), and to join the Mahomedans, he makes known his intention to his neighbours, and, becoming a pupil of the *sreen*, is taught to read and write the Arabic language; and is thenceforward designated *toobee* or convert, till sufficiently versed in the Alcoran to merit the name of *sreen*. The number of Mahomedans compared with the *So-nink-as*, is supposed, in this neighbourhood, (*Yamaliconda* on the *Gambia*,) to be as one to twenty.’

The following particulars rest too much on hearsay evidence; and it is plain from the varying and even contradictory statements which are given relative to the different nations, that no small difficulty attends the obtaining of correct information; especially when the character of one tribe is to be learned only from the representations of individuals belonging to another and perhaps hostile nation. But Mr. Singleton has done well to give us his memoranda, as he took them down at the time, without gloss or comment.

‘Amongst the Jaloofs, the women attend to their households. The Mandingoes send their women into the field. I have not learned whether the Mandingoes have any peculiar distinction of cast or tribe, beyond that of master and slave. But the Jaloofs appear to have several different classes or casts: such as the *Tug*, the *Oodae*, the *Mo-ul*, and the *Gaewell*: to which may be added, the *Laoobies* or *Gipsies*; though I am not certain that these are of Jaloof origin; for I am informed they speak the Mandingo language, and have no settled place of abode, but are continually removing from place to place, resting in the bush, without even a tent to cover them; yet if they find a forsaken hut, they scruple not to inhabit it, so long as they abide in the neighbourhood. They are very filthy in their persons, and not nice in their food. They depend partly on hunting for their subsistence, and partly on the sale of their manufactures; such as the mortar and pestle, buckets, bowls, and stools, all out of solid wood. The axe and the spear are their only

weapons; and, with the latter, they are dexterous in despatching the elephant: the tusks of this animal they also sell, or exchange with the other natives for corn.

'I have since learned that the Lãobies are a distinct people, and that they reside to the east of Cape Verd. On the chart they are entered Lebouies.*

'With respect to the four resident casts or tribes, they are lightly esteemed by the good Jaloofs, as some are pleased to style themselves; and one class, viz. the Gaewell, or singers and fiddlers, are, beyond all the rest, despised: they are not suffered to live within the towns, but must reside towards one certain point on the outside: they are neither permitted to keep cattle, nor to drink sweet milk. If one dies near the water, his corpse is thrown into it; if at a distance, it is heaved into the hollow trunk of a monkey-bread tree, for the natives say that where a Gaewell is buried nothing will grow.

'Though these Gaewell are generally thus despised, they are, at times, much sought unto: for the good Jaloof loves to hear the praise of his ancestors, and when intoxicated, will condescend to hear a Gaewell sing the honours of his family. If the minstrel flatters the employer to satisfaction, his reward is not only certain, but often considerable. In time of war, the Gaewell has another harvest. In the field, or on the march, the king listens to their songs in honour of his predecessors, or of his own past exploits, as chiefs of former times attended to the bards. It is the duty of a Gaewell too, in case the army should be repulsed, to urge them to return to the charge; but here, if he exceed the wishes or the courage of the chief, or even of the soldiers, he may pay for his temerity the price of his life.

'The cast named Tug are smiths of any sort. The Oodae are shoemakers and workers in leather. The Moul are fishermen. No good Jaloof will marry into these casts; but the Gaewell is the only cast to whom they refuse interment. From my hut I have repeatedly seen, and to-night again discern the fires which the natives kindle on the Barra coast opposite, whence the particles of burned grass reach me, though at several miles' distance. They are consuming the reed-like stalks of grass produced last year, to make room for the growth of the coming spring. The natives have not the knowledge to raise artificial grasses, and as they store very little hay, (none, except the stalks of the ground-nut may be so called,) their cattle are half pined between the decline of one year and the spring of the next. It is painful to see the poor ani-

* In Mollien's Travels, *Lãoubés*. (Eclectic Review, N. S. Vol. XIV. p. 15.) That traveller describes them as a distinct race, acknowledging a chief who alone communicates with the government under which they may reside; as supposed to possess considerable wealth; as exempted from military service on payment of a stipulated tax; as fond of finery, and professed fortune-tellers. The same lively but somewhat imaginative writer conjectures the Jaloofs to be of Numidian or Mauritanian origin. In his passage through their territory, he was treated with the utmost kindness. R.

imals picking here and there single blades of any thing green, and of this not having half enough. They are not better circumstanced than the asses in England, that pick their scanty subsistence from the highways.

'The Bà-gas' (it is not stated in what part their territory lies) 'have an image of wood set up by the path leading to each village, near the entrance. It is not properly an object of worship; but is considered as a kind of talisman, to preserve the village. When the villagers feast, they place themselves near to this image, and lay before it the first portion of meat that is cut: they also pour out a small quantity of their beverage at his feet.

'The Limbas, another people, form figures of a man in clay; not in an erect attitude, but stretched across the village paths near to the entrances: this also is to preserve the place, and to be a criterion of the intention of any visitor.

'If natives of another tribe or country, come to one of their towns, and walk over the image, it is considered by the inhabitants a sign of hostile or unfriendly intention. Themselves always turn out of the path for him; but they offer no worship, nor any meat or drink: only, they take great care to supply any loss his face may sustain, from accidents, or by the action of the atmosphere.

'The people named Fic, Ma-ne, or Casso, make small images of wood, which are of no other use than to assist them in divining. The Timmanee language is next in usefulness (to leeward) after the Mandingo. The Bullom is not extensively known.'

We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of transcribing the animated address in which the Committee urge on the attention of Friends the benevolent object they have so much at heart, and which, those who distinguished themselves as *Abolitionists*, in reference to the Trade, are bound, in consistency, to do their utmost to promote, as the only means of giving effect to the emancipation of the much injured African.

'Thus it is proposed to open with that people whose cause we have long been engaged to plead with their oppressors, a direct and continued intercourse, with a view to impart to them some measure of the blessings and benefits conferred upon us, (for this end, doubtless among others,) by a wise and gracious Providence. Our sympathy was, many years since, awakened on their behalf, by the knowledge we had acquired of the circumstances of the slave-trade; and in the great work of procuring the abolition of this gigantic evil, for Britain and her dependencies, we laboured as early and as earnestly as any of our countrymen. Our attention is even now directed to a search after the best means of perfecting this work of mercy. We avow the desire and the purpose, still to plead the cause of the sons of Africa, and to use our best endeavours, in concert with benevolent men of our own and other nations, to put an end to the vile traffic in the persons of men, wherever practised. Do not the circumstances into which we have been led by this engagement, bring home yet further claims on our benevolence towards this people? Can

we be thus desirous to secure to a whole nation, the quiet and permanent enjoyment of their freedom and natural privileges, but on a principle of Christian love? And will not the same principle, followed out to its remoter effects, lead us also to desire, and endeavour, that they may become fellow-partakers with us in the higher and enduring privileges of the gospel? We would wish, doubtless, that their liberties, once acquired, should be used to the glory of their and our Creator, and to the advancement of the kingdom of the Redeemer upon earth. But it is not by leaving them *free in a state of degrading ignorance and helpless barbarism*, that we can hope to contribute to this happy and beneficial result. We have it in our power to impart to them the kind and degree of instruction requisite to prepare their minds for the reception of, at least, the historical truths of the Christian religion, and of those records, so interesting to all men, of the origin of mankind, and of the Divine dispensations in successive ages of the world.

* Need we much persuasion to induce us to do, in this case, to others, as we would, in like circumstances, they should do to us: nay, as others have already done in our behalf, through the medium of our predecessors, the ancient inhabitants of these islands: a people more rude, if we may credit history, than the poor Africans we are now called to succour: a people who, until the light of the Christian religion broke in upon them, wandered in their native forests, naked and tatboed, feeding on acorns, and offering human sacrifices to false gods! With such an opportunity before us as now exists, shall we wait to see the rudiments of useful knowledge planted at some distant day, in the wilds of Africa; not by the peaceable hands of *neighbours*, (for he is my neighbour, however remote his dwelling, who takes pains to do me good,) but by some *warrior*, subduing and giving laws to the land, for his own aggrandizement? Such was the lot of us Britons, in a remote and perilous age: but the dispensations of Divine Wisdom are unsearchable; good was still educed from seeming evil. He, whose mercy is in the heavens, and whose faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds, was still favourable to our land, in the midst of its many distresses: the seeds of Christianity were sown; they grew and prospered; and we now see around us the rising harvest. Rejoicing, as we do, in blessings and benefits thus conferred upon us, is it not our incumbent duty, when the way opens, and the leadings of the Providential hand towards a particular nation are discernible in this respect, cheerfully to apply ourselves, as we may be enabled, to the task of imparting to them a measure of that instruction which, of his unmerited bounty, we have received? The work (it may be said) is great, and our abilities and means comparatively very small. Be it so: but of this we may be assured, that it is now possible for us to *begin* to convey instruction to the natives of that large and interesting continent. The talent is already in our hands: let us occupy with it; and in due season, that which we, if we have faith and courage, shall now originate, may be carried forward by those who shall come after us, with still greater facilities, and with equal perseverance, to a successful issue: both we and they relying on *His* support, and trusting in *His* sufficiency, who hath declared, "I will gather *all nations and tongues*; and they shall come, "and see my glory." Isa. lxvi. 18.

Art. IV. *Julia Severa, ou L'An Quatre Cent Quatre-vingt-douze.* Par J. C. Simonde de Sismondi, Auteur de l'Histoire des Français, de l'Histoire des Républiques Italiennes du Moyen Age, de la Littérature du Midi de l'Europe, &c. &c. &c. 12mo. 3 Tom. Paris. 1822.

THE name of M. Sismondi has long ranked deservedly high in literary estimation. His elaborate work upon the Italian Republics, and his historical sketches of the Literature of the South of Italy, though framed upon plans much too extended to allow us even the hope of their speedy completion from the able hand of their Author, are durable monuments of his industry and genius. We were, therefore, agreeably surprised, when an historical romance from the same pen was announced to us, and heartily disposed to congratulate that large portion of the reading community who are partial to this amusing class of compositions, that the accomplished Writer had at length relaxed from his severer studies, by a slight excursion into the province of fiction. But, whether it be, that a life devoted to sterner occupations, and a mind disciplined to the patient examination of evidence or the methodical compilation of facts, and therefore habituated, by the more regular and uniform order of events, to those gradual and consecutive developments which would not be endured in the world of romance and imagination—whether these habits are fatal to that elasticity and play of invention so indispensably requisite in those who write for the amusement of our lighter hours; or whether advancing age, as it stiffens the muscles, renders also the inventive faculties less active and locomotive; whatever be the real solution of the problem, certain it is, that we have experienced great disappointment in toiling through the pages of *Julia Severa*. The Author himself partly accounts for the circumstance.

‘It is with extreme diffidence,’* he remarks, ‘that I submit to the public judgement, what could not possibly answer the end which I proposed to myself, when I first undertook it, unless I combined qualities to which I have never pretended, and which, even if I once had them, are rarely retained at an age so advanced as mine, and in a life devoted to more serious occupations. It is a romance,—and I could have wished that it had been more completely a romance in point of interest and the fidelity of its pictures. But curiosity transports itself reluctantly thirteen centuries back. Domestic portraiture becomes deficient both in verisimilitude and vivacity, when they are drawn from an epoch so imperfectly known. The personages are lost as it were in distant shadow, when, instead of developing sentiments, it becomes the chief effort of the writer to portray only times, scenes, and manners.’

* Avertissement.

Perhaps, the whole class of fictions to which we give the name of historical romances, are liable to the same defect. Not that the alliance of history and fiction is wholly impracticable; but it must always be a forced, and too frequently a discordant alliance. As their province is distinct, so are their graces, and the unity of the tablet is destroyed by the dissimilitude.

Non bene conveniunt, nec unâ sede morantur.

Even in those matchless productions, the Scottish novels, a series of inventions which constitute an epoch in the history of romantic composition, the difficulty is not always vanquished, though the mightiest strength of the art has been put forth in softening the incongruity of real with imagined events. In *Ivanhoe*, for instance, where the action is thrown back to a remoter period than is usual in the other fictions of that family, so aware are we that there exist few, if any, authentic memorials of the domestic manners of the times, that the conviction perpetually obtrudes itself, of the Author's having drawn upon his fancy rather than his learning. We do not contend, that a diligent antiquary may not collect from genuine records many detached features, both of the public and private life of our Saxon and Norman ancestors;—the solemn tournament, the judicial combat, the formal banquet, and even the domestic meal. But then, as for the living characters of that period,—the unsettled and licentious state of the social condition, the absence of political and civil security, the heroic and chivalrous qualities which, not being absolutely to be designated as vices, must, for that reason, pass for virtues, general ignorance, monkish ascendancy, and popular superstition—the aggregate character compounded of these elements no longer exists. No actual prototype of it is to be found, and its delineation must equally elude the skill of the fictitious, and the research of the historical writer. *Ivanhoe*, *Rowena*, *Front de Boeuf*, *Locksley*, the *Templar*, have, it is true, their predominating qualities assigned to them; but they are qualities which have been taken out of the wardrobe of general nature, and belong to other shapes and modifications of society, than those to which the Author has adapted his fable. Nor do we mean to contend that an interesting romance may not be woven from these materials. All that we assert, is, that the historical dress sits upon the fiction so awkwardly, and is in so frequent danger of falling off,—so unintermitted a contest is going on between our historical recollections and the incidents and personages of the book, that a certain undefinable but unconquerable incredulity,

Amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angit,—

a restless suspicion that real history is needlessly or unskilfully

violated, prevents our being hurried away by the delusion. Whereas, had the romance-writer kept clear of the consecrated ground of history, and contented himself with merely assigning, for his own convenience, a remote period to his action,—had he never invaded the circle of our most settled associations, we should have permitted him without a murmur to exercise the most despotic caprice over the fortunes and destinies of his story, and the credence which real history claims from us, would have been undividedly rendered to his fiction.

If these remarks apply to a story of the fourteenth century, how much more strongly will they apply to incidents and characters which belong to the fifth? What avails it, that the Author has toiled three times successively through Gregory of Tours, or grown pale over the chronicles, and codes, and *acta sanctorum* of this obscure epoch? Farewell to all the appropriate graces and characteristic charms of fictitious composition, if they are to be supplied from the common-place books of historical compilers. What does the reader care about a strict adherence to dates and chronologies, which the writer himself kicks away, when they happen to impede or retard him? A picture of the state of Gaul at the period of the Merovingian invasion, is indispensable to a general history of France; and the reader submits with as good a grace as he can, to the necessity of wading through details whose dull monotony is rarely broken by the interposition of great counsels or splendid achievements. But in works addressed to the fancy and the heart, or, if addressed to the understanding, incapable of reaching it unless by those avenues, they are wretchedly misemployed. They are drag-chains upon the wheels of the imagination: they check and embarrass the march of the fiction. Nor does history itself fare at all better from a union with fiction so ill assorted and unnatural. Occasional separations of bed and board are requisite to keep them in peace with each other. The Author is obliged to place both chronology and fact on the bed of Procrustes, and to stretch and mutilate them at his pleasure.

Such would have been our decided opinion as to this mixed species of composition, even had the *Julia Severa* of M. Sismondi not appeared, as if to illustrate and confirm them. But the learned Writer gives them a most undeniable sanction in his own apology for the imperfections of his work.

* Les héros du roman, Félix, Julia, Sévérus, sont de pure invention. L'action de Volusianus, qui forme le nœud en quelque sorte de tout le drame, et l'expédition de Theudéric, sont également imaginaires. Ce sont des choses qui pouvaient être, mais nous ne savons pas qu'elles aient été. Les autres événemens publics sont en general fondés sur l'histoire.

Je ne me suis, je crois, écarté de la chronologie qu'à l'égard de Saint Senoch, dont la retraite dans la tour de Loches fut *postérieure peut-être d'un demi-siècle à l'époque* ou je l'ai mis en scène.

But Felix, Julia, and Severus are not merely personages purely imaginary : they are as much personages of the eighteenth as of the fifth century, and are, in fact, little more than those common beings, beset with difficulties, struggling with misfortunes, tortured by suspense, agitated with hope, or inflamed with love, that constitute the regular *dramatis personæ* of a romance. Yet, it would be doing M. Sismondi great injustice, were we reluctant to admit, that measuring the execution of his work by the ordinary aim of the novelist, he has shewn himself by no means incapable of furnishing entertainment to those who are addicted to that sort of reading. Amusement is what they expect ; and Julia Severa will not cheat their expectations. They will probably yawn over the passages which are purely historical, and devote to the infernal deities the Vandals, the Suevi, the Silingi, and the Burgundians ; but they will feel a wakeful solicitude for the loves of Felix and Julia, and tremble at the dangers which menace them, when, with a command over the terrific that does not fall far short of Ann Radcliffe herself, the Author encloses them in a subterraneous cavern, and, after a lingering and hopeless separation, brings them again miraculously together.

A much higher and a much purer praise, however, is due to M. Sismondi. His characters are not, like Rousseau's, the creatures of a diseased imagination, or moral paradoxes embodied in the human form. He does not inflame the passions, nor undertake to teach young ladies to be chaste by images of frailty and impurity, or young men to respect the rights of hospitality by examples of treachery and hypocrisy. He attacks superstition, but respects religion ; and there is not in the whole extent of his novel, a single passage which breathes a questionable sentiment, or inculcates a dangerous lesson. He does not, indeed, astonish us by the enraptured eloquence of that extraordinary writer. He does not paint the conflicts of love in colours as warm and captivating as those of St. Preux, when he was wandering among the rocks of Meilleraye. But, for a novel-writer, and a Frenchman, no mean portion of commendation is included in these negatives.

We shall now proceed to give a short summary of the story, extracting occasionally a few passages as favourable specimens of the style and manner of this elegant Author. It is not often, indeed, that we deem ourselves warranted in dedicating so large a space of our journal to works of this class of litera-

ture. But the talent and reputation of M. Sismondi will justify a slight departure from our rule.

In the year 492 of the Christian era, Felix Florentius, the hero, took possession of his vast estates betwixt the Loire and the Cher, the donation of the emperor Majorian to Sylvia Numantia his mother. Noviliacum, the villa, or, as it would now be termed, the chateau of these domains, was yet uninjured by the incursions of the ferocious and predatory tribes who had successively overrun that part of the country. The condition upon which the investiture of the lands had been granted, being that of cultivating its soil, the first cares of Sylvia had been directed to the peopling it with persons capable of tilling it; and she had availed herself of the universal anarchy of the times, to collect together a number of slaves and several wandering families, who would otherwise have perished by famine in the vast and dreary forests of Gaul. They were a remnant of the Celtic inhabitants, and spoke the language, and wore the dress of Celts. These, with two military colonies, consisting of veteran soldiers who had retired from the imperial service, completed the establishment of Sylvia. She was accompanied to her retreat by a grammarian and a priest, whose office it was to assist in the education of Felix, and to initiate him in sacred and profane letters.

Felix, like other heroes of romance, displayed an early aptitude for his studies; and having acquired all the manly and polite accomplishments of the age, he is introduced to the reader's acquaintance, in his twenty-sixth year, on his return from Constantinople, where he had sojourned to execute the last sad duties to his father. It is not long before the heroine also makes her appearance. A few months after the arrival of Felix at Noviliacum, a number of fugitives appeared on the opposite bank of the Loire, imploring succour. They had been driven by an incursion of Franks from the vicinity of Chartres, which the barbarous invaders had burned, after having slaughtered thousands of the inhabitants. Among the party who had fled the battle-axes and sabres of the Franks, was Julia, the daughter of Julius Severus, senator and Count (a Roman dignity) of Chartres, who was then at the court of Clovis at Soissons, soliciting his guarantee and protection from the violence which had long hovered over that unhappy city, and cherishing ulterior views of uniting his daughter in marriage with that sovereign.

We need not hint to those of our readers who are versed in the ordinary modes of heroes' losing their hearts to heroines, that the conquest of Julia over Felix was soon accomplished. It was therefore natural that he should endeavour to assist the

Count of Chartres in his project of securing the Roman province of the Gauls, and thus establish an insuperable claim to the hand of his beautiful daughter. His vast possessions, equally distant from Orleans and Tours, suggested to him the necessity of concerting with the governors of those cities,—Numerianus, an imbecile and contemptible character, and Volusianus, the archbishop of the latter province.

On his return from Orleans, where the indolence and voluptuousness of Numerianus rendered all serious discussion concerning the common danger futile and ineffectual, he arrives at the cave of Pan; one of the few remnants still existing of the pagan superstition of Rome, where he has an interview with a solitary Sybil, the only inhabitant of its desolate ruins.

‘ La façade du temple était absolument démolie; l’intérieur était comblé de ruines, d’où s’élevaient des hautes tiges de ciguë, tandis que le lierre tapissait les murs latéraux. Mais la muraille du fond était encore debout; elle servait d’appui à une espèce de hangard qui avait été batti derrière, et où des fragmens de colonnes, des architraves, des marbres sculptés avec soin, servaient à soutenir un toit de chaume. C’est là que vivait Lamia, que Félix trouva assise devant sa porte, mais qui s’éleva à son approche avec un respect qui n’était pas sans dignité.

‘ Lamia était déjà courbée par l’âge, mais les traits prononcés de son visage, n’indiquaient aucune faiblesse: ses yeux enfoncés, sa peau sèche et jaune, et sa maigreur avait quelque chose d’effrayant. Cependant le mouvement seul de sa physionomie commandait l’attention: ses yeux s’animoient comme elle parlait; il y avait alors une sorte d’inspiration dans ses regards, et dans le son de sa voix une assurance, une emphase d’expression qui contrastoient avec sa misère. Ses habits avaient aussi quelque chose d’étrange: des couleurs éclatantes, des étoffes précieuses, s’y trouvaient mêlées des haillons, et Félix croyait vaguement y reconnaître quelques parties des vêtemens que dans tous les anciens tableaux on voyait aux prêtresses des temples.’

Meg Merrilies and the half inspired witches of the Waverley school, seem to have been present to the imagination of M. Sismondi, when he drew this picture. We insert the colloquy in the course of which the hero learns that Julius Severus adhered to the interdicted religion.

‘ “Ma bonne mère,” lui dit Félix en l’abordant, “l’obscurité s’approche, et j’aurais besoin d’un guide pour me conduire.”

‘ “L’obscurité est déjà sur nous,” répondit Lamia, en fixant sur lui ses regards perçans, “et j’ai reconduit à la vraie lumière plusieurs de ceux qui s’égarèrent.”

‘ “Je craignais qu’à votre âge vous n’eussiez pas la force de me reconduire à Noviliacum.”

‘ Lamia avait supposé d’abord que les paroles de Félix étaient

figurées, et que pour demander une chose défendue par les lois, il avait employé un langage équivoque, qu'il pût rétracter au besoin ; mais voyant que c'était vraiment un guide qu'il demandait, elle reprit. " Je parle d'un temps ancien ; à présent vous voyez bien que je ne dois plus songer à m'éloigner de ma demeure."

" Cette vie solitaire, et ces réponses excitèrent la curiosité de Florentius. Il porta ses regards sur sa misérable demeure. Il crut y remarquer l'autel du temple, et le simulachre du dieu qui y avait été adoré, et distinguer aussi la coupe des libations et la hache des sacrifices. Curieux d'examiner cette partie des ruines, il se préparait à y descendre. Lamia l'arrêta. " Ne profanez pas, incrédule, ce dernier séjour des dieux que vous avez chassés de leurs temples ; ne cherchez point à pénétrer des mystères que vous n'adorez plus ; redoutez la vengeance de ce Pan, qui dissipa les armées de vos pères. Les lois de Théodose ont déclaré coupable du lèse-majesté, et condamné à mort, ceux qui offrent des sacrifices aux dieux de nos pères. Sans doute vous n'en voulez pas à la vie d'une vieille femme ; sans doute vous n'avez pas appris en Grèce, à cette école d'Athènes ou notre religion est encore professée par tout ce qu'il y a de philosophes et de litterateurs illustres, à épier les adorateurs des dieux antiques pour les perdre ? Mais alors, pourquoi vous rendre complice de cette action, qui pour vous est un crime, pour nous une vertu ?"

In answer to some inquiries of Felix concerning the rites of the prohibited superstition, the old lady proceeds :

" Vous autres grands remarquez à peine l'existence du pauvre ; comment sauriez vous s'il a des opinions ? Sans doute il reste parmi nous de sectateurs des anciens dieux de Rome ; il en reste aussi des dieux des druides. Mais où sont aujourd'hui les villages d'où sortaient autrefois les joyeuses processions des Lupercales ? Ils sont ruinés comme ce temple qui me couvre de ses débris."

" Vous êtes prêtresse ?"

" Je le suis. Et il n'y a pas si long temps qu'un homme, votre égal en rang, qu'un comte est venu au milieu de ces ruines, bruler l'encens devant la statue du dieu, et consulter l'oracle. Connaissez vous Julius Sévère ?" Tom. I. pp. 119—126.

The old hag leaves him still in doubt whether his daughter had been educated in the same faith ; an apprehension which threw dismay and alarm over all the dreams of love and hope which he had so fondly cherished.

The ambitious and haughty character of Volusianus, the archbishop, is well drawn.

" L'aspect de Volusianus était vénérable, mais il inspirait autant de crainte que de respect. Sa taille était élevée, et son corps, quoique épuisé par les jeûnes et les veilles, était droit et comme inflexible ; son teint était jaune, ses joues creuses, sa tête était ombragée d'une abondance des cheveux noirs et courts ; l'âge, qui avait marqué ses traces sur tout le reste de sa figure, ne les avait point blanchis, et ce

contraste donnoit une dureté singulière à sa physionomie. Ses regards perçans annonçaient dans le successeur de St. Martin, un juge des pénitens plutôt qu'un père ; un champion inébranlable de l'autorité des infidèles ; un persécuteur redoutable des païens et des hérétiques ; un homme enfin qui saurait employer toutes les ressources de la politique mondaine pour servir ce qu'il regardait comme les intérêts du Ciel.' Tom. I. pp. 153, 154.

In his interview with this proud prelate, Felix first learned the views entertained by Julius Severus of the marriage of Julia with Clovis. Volusianus easily read the state of his mind. But though the interests of the Church seemed imperiously to demand that she should not be united to Clovis, he was equally indisposed to her alliance with Felix, apprehensive lest the power and the talent of Severus, the implacable foe of the priesthood, should be strengthened by the reputation and wealth of the senator Florentius.

It was not long before Felix discovered that his interesting guest had not been educated in the superstition of her father ; and his heart was lightened by the discovery. At Soissons, having received ample powers to negotiate with Clovis on behalf of the different cities and provinces between the Seine and the Loire, he was courteously received by Julius Severus, to whom he bore letters from his daughter. There is much talent in the following delineation of a man habituated to the wiles of policy, and taught to dissemble them beneath a polished courtesy of exterior manner.

' Julius Sévérus, après avoir lu les lettres de sa fille, lui fit conter avec détail tout ce qu'il avait appris de la fuite de Chartres. Il l'interrompait pour exprimer sa vive reconnoissance pour ce qu'il appelait l'héroïsme de Félix. Il écoutait avec une attention si soutenue, il jugeait si bien les caractères, il parlait ensuite de ses propres projets, des négociations commencées, avec l'apparence d'un si entier abandon, que Félix, enchanté d'un esprit si fin et si juste, croyait en avoir beaucoup appris. Ce ne fut qu'en repassant ensuite dans sa tête tous ses souvenirs, qu'il s'aperçut que Julius Sévérus ne lui avait absolument dit que ce que Félix savait déjà. Tout ce que lui avait paru si nouveau, n'était point des faits, mais de la philosophie appliquée à la politique. Sévérus avait le talent de généraliser ses idées ; et remontant des faits aux principes, pour redescendre ensuite des principes aux individus, il présentait à l'esprit un exercice constant, un jeu d'idées toujours riche, toujours ingénieux ; mais il ne révélait rien sur les circonstances actuelles, dont il se réservait à lui seul la connoissance.' Tom. I. pp. 184, 185.

In the conference with Clovis, the pomp and retinue of the barbarous monarch are detailed at great length, and no doubt with much historical precision. The consternation of Felix

may be easily imagined, when the long-haired king of the Merovingian line thus abruptly addressed Severus.

“ Cet ambassadeur des Gaulois, ” dit il en regardant Félix, “ a-t-il amené ici votre fille ? ”

“ Très-excellent roi, il n'a pas été possible. ”

“ Qu'elle arrive au plus tôt a Soissons. ”

There is no reasoning with these august personages. Felix communicates to Severus the attachment which he had cherished for his daughter, and his conviction that his passion was not unrequited. But the crafty politician prevails over the tender father; and all the answer which he can obtain, is, a sort of political dissertation upon the state of Gaul and his dependence upon the favour of Clovis, who, by one act of power, could accomplish his ruin. But Felix more than suspects that Severus is anxiously bent upon the alliance, and waits only for a favourable opportunity of removing Julia to Soissons; and in fact, he soon discovers that he had already written to her a peremptory mandate for her departure, and made arrangements for her journey under the escort of a matron of Chartres, who was to accompany her from Noviliacum. Having completed his negotiations, therefore, he hastens with a heavy heart to take his last adieu of Julia, solicitous to arrive at Noviliacum before Sulpitia, the lady under whose charge Julia was to travel.

Hesodunum was about two leagues from the mansion of Florentius. It was a vast Celtic ruin, and admirably adapted for a novel-writer by reason of its subterraneous recesses and secret apartments. It was agreed that Julia and Sylvia should meet Felix at this interesting and romantic spot on his road from Soissons. It was a dreadful parting between the lovers. But time runs with unperceived swiftness upon these occasions, and the boat was ready to convey them back to Noviliacum, where they expected the matron who was to convey Julia to Soissons and the hated arms of the Merovingian tyrant. Their passage from the ruins to the river, was by one of those subterraneous vaults which, in the age of the Druidical superstition, had been cut through the rock. Sylvia and the rest of the party were before, and the lovers lingered on their walk. She was about to chide them for their delay; but what was her astonishment as soon as she reached the opening of the cavern, to find it immoveably shut, and that Julia and Florentius were enclosed in its recesses.

‘ Ce n'était point une porte, mais un énorme bloc de rocher, qui tournant au pivot, au moyen de ressorts invisibles, ouvrait ou fermait la caverne, selon qu'il se présentait de cote ou de face, et s'emboitait si

exactement dans l'ouverture qui lui était destinée, qu'on ne le distinguait plus à l'œil de la masse inébranlable dont il semblait faire partie. Ce rocher pouvait être mis de l'intérieure avec tant de facilité, par ceux qui connaissaient ses secrets ressorts, que Sylvia n'avait pas même entendu le bruit qu'il avait fait en se fermant.' Tom. II. pp. 103, 104.

Our readers may easily imagine that the Author avails himself of much terrific description upon this occasion. The mystery is solved after the fashion of the *Radcliffe* school, by human agency. The monks of St. Martin of Tours are in possession of the secrets of this prison-house. The lovers are forcibly seized and carried by the agents of ecclesiastical tyranny to that monastery, where they are separated; and under the pretext of saving the soul of Julia, who is considered as attached to the pagan superstitions, she is rigorously confined in a cell, and of course undergoes the most barbarous treatment, while Felix is immured in the adjacent monastery. The events now follow with great rapidity. To liberate his daughter, whom he discovers to be in the power of the archbishop of Tours, and on whom, it seems, this dreadful act of tyranny had been exercised in order to break off the alliance with Clovis, which that intriguing ecclesiastic dreaded as fatal to the interests of the Church,—Severus engages a chieftain of the Franks, Theuderic, to proceed with an armed force to demand her. The result of this is the liberation of Felix. But Julia has been, in the meanwhile, carried to the solitary tower of St. Senoch, where, after a variety of intermediate events, duly seasoned with the terrible, Felix arrives, and accidentally discovers that she is imprisoned in a neighbouring apartment. The lovers are united. Clovis is persuaded to elevate Clotilda to his throne, and all parties live happily and prosperously ever afterwards.

Such is a faint outline of M. Sismondi's romance. Quaint and humorous characters are occasionally attempted; but we cannot congratulate the Author upon his sketches either of the pedant Eudoxus, or the priest Martin. Lamia is an imperfect shadow, rather than a picture. It seems as if the Author, in his original conception, had destined her for higher agencies than he afterwards found it convenient to assign her.

'Amphora cœpit

Institui; currente rotâ cur urceus exit?'

But, with these exceptions, combined with those which we felt it incumbent upon us to hint at in the beginning of our article, we can recommend *Julia Severa* as an interesting, and, in some respects, an instructive fiction.

Art. V. *The History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Lichfield*; illustrated by a Series of Engravings of Views, Elevations, Plans, and Details of the Architecture of the Church: with biographical Anecdotes of the Bishops of Lichfield and Coventry. By John Britton, F.S.A. Medium 4to. pp. 74. Price 1l. 18s. London. 1820.

MR. BRITTON is well known as the author and compiler of a series of valuable illustrations of our national antiquities. Without the pretension of originality, he has exerted himself with successful diligence in the investigation of ancient records and of interesting remains connected with the architectural history of England; and the result of his labours has been given to the world in a series of volumes which display considerable care in the collection of the materials, and, on the whole, a judicious discrimination in the arrangement. Of the graphic decorations, it is not easy to speak too highly: they are, in general, selected with great felicity, and executed with uncommon skill. To the able draughtsmen and engravers employed by Mr. Britton, we are indebted for an extensive and systematic combination of minute and picturesque representations of antique structures, in all the variety of sections, plans, elevations, ornamental details, and general views.

In the present volume, Mr. B. will be found to have fully sustained his previously acquired character. He has collected and compressed a considerable mass of historical and elucidatory information, and, with the assistance of his plates, has given a satisfactory account of the fine building which is the immediate subject of his researches. We shall not follow him through his laborious investigations of dates and epochs. Bishop de Clinton (A.D. 1129 to 1148) is supposed to have been the founder; and the last additions appear to have been made early in the reign of Edward III.

The structure, without approaching to the richness and grandeur of the more distinguished ecclesiastical edifices, is justly entitled to a liberal share of praise, both for its design and its execution. The western door-way is uncommonly beautiful, while the nave and choir are lofty and impressive. The Lady Chapel also furnishes an interesting plate; and the entrance to the Chapter house, with the rich and elegant arches and capitals distinctly portrayed in separate engravings, presents a noble specimen of architectural invention.

But after all, to our minds, the noblest ornament of this Cathedral is Chantrey's exquisite monument. This unrivalled production has never been looked upon without intense emotion by any one of right feeling. We do not quote Mr. Britton's description, for we altogether dislike it; and we shall not at-

tempt a substitute, for we could not satisfy ourselves in its execution. Nor can we praise the representation which he has given, since it is altogether inadequate to the inimitable beauty and pathos of the original. Mackenzie, able as he is in architectural picture, should have known that this was beyond his strength. Corbould has succeeded far better in his copy exhibited in the Soho Square collection of ancient and modern drawings.

Among the biographical sketches of the occupants of the See of Lichfield, we find the following anecdotes of Bishop Hacket, 'the great restorer of the Cathedral.'

'Hacket was, in 1640, appointed one of the sub-committee for settling the peace of the Church, and spoke eloquently on that occasion at the bar of the House of Commons. When the use of the Liturgy was prohibited under severe penalties, Hacket continued to read it in his church of St. Andrew, Holborn. A sergeant with a file of men, was sent to arrest him during service, and ordered him to desist on pain of instant death. "Soldiers," said Hacket, "I am doing my duty, do you do yours;" and intrepidly continued the service, unmolested by the soldiers, who were overawed by his firmness. When a bishopric was first offered to him, he declined it, saying, "he had rather future times should ask, why Dr. Hacket had not a bishopric, than why he had one."'

Mr. Britton seems to be occupied in making the grand tour of British antiquity. We wish him success in his undertaking, and tender him our thanks for the pleasure which we have derived from his past labours.

Art. VI. *A History of the Island of Madagascar*, comprising a political Account of the Island, the Religion, Manners, and Customs of its Inhabitants, and its natural Productions: with an Appendix, containing a History of the several Attempts to introduce Christianity into the Island. By Samuel Copland. 8vo. pp. 370. Price 10s. 6d. London. 1822.

WORKS illustrative of the history and geography of Africa are crowding upon us in rapid succession. That mysterious and impenetrable continent which has been so long shrouded from the eye of science, seems about to have the inmost darkness of its recesses laid open to the day. The exploits of Burckhardt and Belzoni have given fresh impulse to the spirit of African discovery. Mr. Burchell's travels in the South have scarcely reached us, when another splendid quarto announces Mr. Waddington's exploratory travels in Ethiopia. In the North, other adventurous travellers are entering upon a field of discovery almost equally untrodden by European visitors,—tracks the latest extant description of which has been furnished by the father of history. While on the western coast, the

Missionaries are pushing on their moral conquests far into the heart of the sable kingdoms of the Interior. The result of these simultaneous exertions in so many opposite directions, has been to bring Africa more immediately under the fixed attention of the public, in an aspect widely different from that in which alone it had been customary to regard that devoted continent,—as the mere nursery and mart of slaves. And should a line of intercourse with the interior, from any one of the points, at which an entrance has been made good, be permanently maintained, it cannot fail to lead to the introduction of the civilizing arts, and eventually to the diffusion of that higher and better knowledge which can alone give effect to all plans of civilization.

The abolition of the slave-trade in the island of Madagascar, is, in every point of view, a most important and interesting event. Of all our allies, the only one who has fulfilled his engagements to abolish this infamous traffic, after all the negotiations, indemnifications, and subsidies which have been employed in order to bribe the concurrence of their Most Christian, and Most Faithful, and most faithless majesties, the only one who has kept his word, is the half-savage sovereign of Madagascar, Radama, king of Ova. This extraordinary man, in the intelligent zeal he discovers for the civilization of his people, not less than in the good faith by which his conduct has been characterized, deserves to rank far above most of the sovereigns of civilized Europe. So strong possession has the idea of civilizing the Island, taken of his mind, that he has determined to make any sacrifice necessary to its accomplishment. He is described as about thirty years of age, of an affable and cheerful disposition, and of a strong, intelligent mind. 'In his intercourse with his subjects he is kind and 'familiar, and they almost adore him.' Bred up among savages, he had never been taught either by experience or by books, to appreciate the value of the benefits which he is so solicitous to extend to his subjects; and the large revenue which he derived from the slave-trade, rendered it in the highest degree improbable that he should readily consent to abandon it. The attempt, moreover, was attended on his part by no small difficulty or danger. The trade had been so long established, and was so completely interwoven with the whole system of civil and military policy, that the chiefs, who derived the principal part of their revenues also from that source, were determined to counteract the design. The first step towards accomplishing it, was the suppression of the *annual attack* on the island of Johanna and the Comoros. This took place in 1816, in consequence simply of the representa-

tions of Governor Farquhar; but at that time Radama had not sufficient power to enforce the observance of another proclamation, commanding the abolition of the Trade itself. In the course of 1817 and 1818, upwards of *seventeen hundred* slaves had been transported from Madagascar to the Mauritius alone. The intercourse which Radama kept up with the British, was, however, the means of his becoming more and more convinced of the impolicy and iniquity of the trade. In the mean time, his power and influence continually increased; and when, in the year 1820, a fresh proposal of a treaty for the total abolition of the Slave-trade, was made by our Governor at the Mauritius, Radama found himself in a situation that enabled him to enforce a compliance with his proclamation.

Mr. Copland's narrative of the circumstances attending this important measure, extracted from the Missionary Accounts, though not entirely new to many of our readers, will be found extremely interesting. Mr. Hastie, who was appointed commissioner to undertake the management of the affair, sailed from the Mauritius in the beginning of September, having attached to his suite the Rev. Mr. Jones, a missionary who had previously visited the island. The deputation arrived at Tamatave on the 9th.

The chief of this place, named Jean René, was brother to the King of Ova. He received them in a very courteous manner; but informed them, that his brother was then engaged in a war against some of the southern chiefs, and that he himself was at war both in the north and south. The commissioner also learned, that both the natives and Europeans at Tamatave, who were interested in the slave-trade, were resolved to do all in their power to prevent his proceeding to the interior, and thus, if possible, to frustrate the design of his embassy.

The scene which presented itself at Tamatave and the neighbourhood, was of the most heart-rending description. Two slave vessels had just made up their cargoes, and sailed a few days after the arrival of the British; but there were a great number of slave-dealers waiting the arrival of more victims, who were expected from the interior, the fruits of the wars which then prevailed. Mr. Hastie despatched a messenger to the king of Ova, informing him of his arrival, having previously learned that his majesty had returned victorious to his capital.

On their journey to Tananarive, the capital, the mission met upwards of 1300 slaves, fettered and chained together, who were proceeding to the place of sale. An answer of the most favourable nature from the king, reached Mr. Hastie at a town in their route, which led across numerous rivers and mountains, and 'by many large and strongly fortified towns and villages,' to Tananarive, where they arrived after a journey of three weeks, having travelled about two hundred and seventy miles. Here

the embassy was met by two native princes, who had been at the Mauritius to be educated under Mr. Hastie's superintendence. The 'king's secretary' came soon after to inform the commissioner, that his majesty rejoiced exceedingly at his arrival, and to appoint the hour for his presentation. The account of the interview has a little too much of the magnificent thrown into it, by means of the terms, 'royal palace,' 'court yard,' &c. which transport us to St. James's, rather than to the *donac* of an African chief. But the courtesy and good-will of Radama did not evaporate in empty ceremony. Several conferences were held with his majesty, during successive days, on the subject of the treaty, without any thing decisive being agreed on. At length, at a second meeting of the grand *cabar*, which the king had convened for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiments of his subjects, and to which both Mr. Hastie and Mr. Jones were invited, the king told them, that he had maturely considered what had been said on the subject, but repeated, what he had urged before, that his people must first be instructed, in order to enable them to have a clear idea of the advantages of the treaty; and he requested permission to send some of them to England for that purpose. Mr. Hastie promised that every means should be adopted for promoting the instruction of his people, and adverting to the object of Mr. Jones's mission, judiciously pointed out what had been effected in the South-Sea Islands, where, through the agency of a few missionaries, idolatry had been abolished, Christianity embraced, wars put a stop to, and the arts of civil life introduced. This representation is stated to have made a strong impression on the mind of Radama. On the following day, he sent a letter to Mr. Hastie, addressed to Governor Farquhar, in which he stated his anxiety to conclude the proposed treaty, but required that he should be allowed to send some of his people to the Mauritius and to England, and that artificers should be sent to Madagascar. This led to further conferences, in which it was Mr. Hastie's object to avoid committing himself, without further instructions, by any specific stipulation. But the king was firm, and on the 11th of October, he transmitted to the commissioner his final determination; namely, that the treaty should be signed that day, and the former proclamation abolishing the Slave-trade, republished, *provided* Mr. Hastie would agree to take twenty of his subjects for instruction; ten to proceed to the Mauritius, and ten to England. Mr. Hastie hesitated, but only for a moment. He was exceeding the authority with which he was invested; but, after consulting with Mr. Jones, he declared his determination to agree to Radama's proposal, even if he should be obliged to take upon himself the

expenses of the ten Madegasse youths who were to be sent to England. The treaty was accordingly agreed on, a *cabar* convened, the proclamation issued, and despatches forwarded to the different districts, to put an entire stop to the selling of slaves for exportation. Thousands of natives were assembled round the 'palace,' awaiting, in anxious suspense, the determination of the conference. As soon as the happy result was announced, and the British flag hoisted in union with that of Madagascar, 'a burst of transport,' says the Narrator, 'the spontaneous tribute of a grateful and feeling people to their monarch for the gift of liberty, shook the palace, and overpowered the thunder of the cannon which were firing on the hill.' The slaves who had been conveyed to the coast, were, on the promulgation of the treaty, sent back into the interior, to be employed in husbandry and domestic services; and 'such,' it is added, 'was the vigilance of the officers appointed to superintend the observance of the proclamation, that not a slave was sold or sent out of the country, and the European slave-dealers were constrained to retire confounded and dismayed at their disappointment.'

A few days after, the selection took place of the young persons to be sent to England and the Mauritius for education. A great competition ensued as to whose children should have the king's permission to go, it being considered a very high honour. Such was the eagerness manifested, that one person said he would give three thousand dollars for permission to send his child. "Well," said the king, "give me fifteen hundred and he shall go." After a little hesitation, the man answered he would give that sum. "Well," rejoined the king, "as you are in earnest, and sincere in your request, he shall go for nothing." The selection was made from amongst the children of the richest and most respectable people in the capital. Princes Rataffe and Endrian Semisate, brothers-in-law to Radama, were deputed to conduct these youths to their destination; the former to England, and the latter to the Mauritius.

The Madegasse youths who accompanied Prince Rataffe to this country, are at present under the care of the British and Foreign School Society. When they have completed their education, they are to be placed under proper masters, to be instructed in various trades and manufactures. Immediately after the affair of the Slave-trade had been disposed of, Mr. Jones, the nature of whose mission had been previously explained by Mr. Hastie, was admitted to a conference with the king. Radama assured him, that he had nothing so much at heart as the instruction of his people, and requested him to inform the Directors of the Missionary Society, that his pro-

tection and support should be extended to any missionaries they might think proper to send.

“ Help me,” said he, “ to enlighten and civilize my subjects, and you will for ever bind me to the British nation.” The Queen-mother also assured Mr. Hastie, that this alone was the basis of the treaty just concluded. “ Had money,” said she, “ been the object, I would never have agreed to it ; but I will now support the plan with all my might.”

In August last, the Directors of the Missionary Society sent out the Rev. Mr. Jefferies in the quality of missionary, with four other persons as mechanics. Mr. Jones also continues to reside at the court of Radama, and has sixteen children placed under his care by the king, for the purpose of receiving an English education, among whom is the heir apparent. The British Government, with a liberality that does them honour, have declined interfering with the views and proceedings of the Missionary Society. It is greatly to the credit of Radama, that while he is perfectly willing that his subjects should be instructed in the Christian religion, and declares that he has himself no faith in the superstitions of his country, he is peculiarly anxious that no violence should be offered to the religious prejudices of his people, and has no idea of exerting his royal authority to compel them to become converted. Under these favourable circumstances has Christianity obtained an introduction into this vast island, one of the largest in the world, ‘ having the patronage of the king and his nobles, not,’ remarks the Writer, ‘ as a matter of court policy, as is too frequently the case in polished nations, but in the honest simplicity and sincerity of their hearts, because they are convinced of its superiority over their present system of religion.’

What effect the example of Radama may have on other African states, it is impossible to say. To have annihilated one depôt of slaves, and to have proved the practicability of abolishing the traffic by the introduction of civilization, are great points gained. One of the first results of the efforts of the Missionaries will be, we may reasonably presume, the cessation of infanticide, which has hitherto prevailed, under the direction of their magicians, or astrologers, to a horrid extent ; the fate of the new-born infant being determined by the aspect of the planets or some other omen, or by the lucky or unlucky character of the month or day of the month, on which it is born. The superstitions of the Madagasses are, in many respects, peculiar. Their religion appears to be a sort of mongrel Mohammedanism, either derived from the Arabs with whom they have

been in constant intercourse, or grafted on some more ancient traditional faith. Circumcision is practised among them universally; and the rite is celebrated with great solemnity. This circumstance, together with the appellation by which one class of the natives are distinguished, of *Zafe Hibrahim*, or descendants of Abraham, is the foundation of the opinion which ascribes the origin of the Madagasses to the Jewish nation. But Mr. Copland remarks, that there is no other point of similarity between either their religious or their civil habits, and those of the Jews; they have neither customs, traditions, rites, nor ceremonies sufficiently analogous to justify the hypothesis; and there are some points of marked contrariety. They make no use of any animals as beasts of burthen, and have no kind of vehicle on wheels.

‘The use of letters, too, was unknown till within the last three hundred and fifty years, when it was introduced into some of the provinces by the Arabs who conquered the Island. And, to conclude this negative evidence, the language which is spoken universally throughout the Island, (with only a provincial difference,) bears no analogy to the Hebrew, but is “a mixture of Arabic and Greek, being agreeable to the latter in the manner of speaking, in the order and conjunction of nouns and verbs active, and in being extremely copious.” . . . The learning of the Island is principally confined to the Ombiasses (or magicians), and the Arabic character is the only one in use with them. These were introduced by the *Zafe Ramini*;’ (or *Rahimini*; that is, children of Imina, the mother of Mahommed, from whom they boast of having descended;) ‘they are twenty-four in number, written from the right to the left, but the pronunciation of some of them differs from that of the Arabic.’

Besides the two distinct races above mentioned, the *Zafe Ramini*, and the *Zafe Hibrahim*, both of which are whites,* and the former of which, at least, is an intrusive race, there are ‘the indigenous blacks,’ who are supposed to be the aborigines. These are divided into four classes, the first of whom, the *Voadziri*, are said to trace their origin to the ancient sovereigns of the Island. Their wealth in slaves and cattle is considerable, and they retain the possession of several villages. Although superseded in the sovereignty by the race of *Ramini*, the natives still hold them in veneration. The lowest class, the *Ondeves*, are slaves by extraction, and are kept in entire subjection,—the Pariahs of the social system.

There can be no doubt that these several races are of distinct origin. Some of the olive-coloured natives, who are of small stature, with lank, smooth hair, bear a strong resemblance to the

* Their colour is stated to be similar to that of the Egyptians and the Abyssinians: some, however, are copper-coloured, but the greater number are of an olive colour.

Malay Indians. These probably are the class referred to as having sprung from the 'sailors who came over with the *Zafe Rahimini*,' or from the ancient pirates, and as subsisting chiefly by fishing. Others are described as 'tall and well proportioned, with crisped locks, large and beautiful eyes, an easy carriage, and an open, unreserved countenance, their colour nearly black,' and as differing but little from the natives on the Malabar Coast. The Anacandrians, a branch of the *Zafe Ramini*, are distinguished by long hair, hanging down in curls, and by a reddish complexion. The woolly hair of the blacks marks their affinity to the Caffres, or Mozambiques. In the language, M. de Pagés thought he perceived some inflexions of voice which occur in that of the Philippine Isles. It has also received a mixture of Portuguese. The probability is, that the Island, if it was not originally, as some have supposed, a part of the Continent, was peopled from the opposite coast, and that 'the Whites,' are all of Asiatic extraction. Their traditions, their notion of a day of rest, the abhorrence of swine's flesh, and other peculiarities of the *Zafe Hibrabim*, their necromancy and astromancy, as well as their written language, may all, perhaps, be referred to the Arabs and the Moors, and chiefly to the comparatively modern colony of the *Zafe Ramini*; one class of whom, it is remarkable, is called *Ontampassemaca*, or 'people from the sandy deserts of Mecca.'

Mr. Copland's "history" is a very respectable compilation, and contains more information on the subject than could be obtained from any one previous work. He has spared no pains in collecting materials, and the works from which he has drawn most of his information, are but little known to general readers. His chief authorities are, Flacourt's History of Madagascar; M. de V's Voyage to Madagascar; Voyages of the Dutch East India Company; Drury's Narrative; Rochon's Voyage; Benyowsky's Memoirs; Wadstrom's Essay on Colonization; and the Missionary Accounts. M. de Pagés, whose "Travels round the World" contain a very full description of the Madagasses, is not referred to; and we suppose that Mr. Copland had not seen the work. Mr. C. states the Island to be 900 miles long from North to South, and 300 broad in its widest part. De Pagés gives its length as about 900, and its breadth 100. Pinkerton, who chiefly follows Rochon, states its length to be about 840 G. miles by about 220 of medial breadth, and describes it as abounding with grand and beautiful scenery. Mr. Copland's professed object is, to excite a more general interest on behalf of the people who have, in so remarkable a manner, placed themselves 'under the protection, or rather, tuition of Great Britain.' This interest, their history cannot fail to inspire, and the volume will be found by no means deficient in entertainment.

Art. VII. *An Account of the Abipones*, an Equestrian People of Paraguay. From the Latin of Martin Dobrizhoffer. In 3 Volumes. 8vo. pp. 1300. Price 1l. 16s. London. 1822.

THIS publication has, we believe, arisen out of Mr. Southey's voluminous and valuable, though somewhat heavy history of the Brazils. It contains the text and commentary of an eighteen years' residence, in the capacity of a Jesuit missionary, among the savage inhabitants of South America; and while it bears some rather fatiguing marks of the lengthy and indiscriminating garrulity of an old man, pleasantly occupied in renewing the recollections of his past labours, it is, on the whole, an interesting book, containing much novel and amusing information respecting the habits and impulses of savage life, and throwing considerable light on the character and distribution of the interior tribes of Paraguay.

The Writer was, as far as personal knowledge and experience might be concerned, well furnished for the business of description, since he had been long and intimately conversant with the individuals and the localities which are the subjects of his narrative. He was born at Gratz in Styria, on the 7th of September, 1717. At the age of nineteen, he was admitted into the order of the Jesuits; that 'injured society,' whose extinction, in the opinion of Mr. Southey, (if the superintendence of this publication be rightly ascribed to him,) was so 'unjust and impolitic.' We shall take the liberty of questioning if it were either. Impolitic it was not, either on the part of the monarchs whose authority was endangered by the Jesuitic institute, or on that of the Pope, who yielded only to a more urgent and imperious policy than that which dissuaded from the disbanding of his Janizaries. Unjust it can appear only to those who are either unacquainted with the morality of the Jesuits, or determined resolutely to close their eyes to the spirit and tendency of the system by which the movements of the order were controlled and directed.

In 1749, Martin Dobrizhoffer was sent on a mission to South America. He was first stationed in the Guarany Reductions, and afterwards among the Abipones; a wild race by whom the advantages of civilization were as yet but imperfectly recognised. When the Jesuits were expelled from the Spanish colonies, he returned to Europe, and resided at Vienna until his death in July, 1791. He is said to have been much in the favour of Maria Theresa, who used frequently to send for him, that she might hear from his own lips the details of his adventurous life. Thus qualified, he published, in 1784, the Latin original of these volumes, with a

title including in its promise, the geographical, natural, military, and civil history of the savage tribes among which he had resided.

Martin seems to have been an honestly disposed person, and, where his professional views and prejudices have not warped him, and he has been uninfluenced by a palpable and rather *touchy* disposition to defend and eulogize the conduct of his order, we are quite inclined to receive his statements as those of a man who, without enlarged and philosophical habits of thinking, and with little dexterity in the discrimination of evidence, has narrated in simplicity and good faith that which he saw and heard. His harmless vanity expends itself in a very sincere self-admiration, without appearing to interfere materially with the correctness of his details. His pompous description of an attack made by six hundred savages on a post defended only by himself and ten or a dozen other determined men, has excited some incredulity; and it is, in truth, made the most of by the good Missionary, who describes his own valour and coolness in very complacent terms. 'Even at this day,' he modestly informs the world, 'I bear about me a scar, the witness of a signal wound, the monument of my contempt of death and defence of the colony, and a constant memorial of beloved Paraguay.' A little gasconade of this kind does not, however, materially lessen our confidence in the substantial accuracy of a man's story; and it is so much in the manner of the worthy Dobrizhoffer to travel on stilts, that we are willing to pardon an occasional *extravaganza* when his personal achievements are in question.

'Having examined every place in the vicinity,* (he proceeds, after having finished his tale of heroism and conduct,) 'I became more tranquil, and wrote an account to the Governor at Assumption of the state of our affairs. With my letter, I sent, wrapped up in my bloody shirt sleeve, the arrow which had wounded me; a trophy of the religious obedience which had fixed me to this perilous colony. The arrow, and the sleeve stained with my blood, attracted all eyes in the metropolis, and were honourably preserved as monuments. The Spaniards judged of the wound, and of my danger, partly from the accounts of the Abiponian messengers, partly from the size of the barbed arrow, and as report usually swells in its progress, my acquaintance mourned me as dead, and offered the sacrifice of the host for my atonement. Others, knowing me to be still alive, honoured me with the title of Confessor of the Lord; as my administering baptism to the Cacique of the Tobas was the occasion of my receiving the wound.'

We are not quite so well satisfied of Martin's scrupulous veracity, in his attempt to vindicate his associates from the accredited imputation of a deeply laid scheme to make

themselves the founders and masters of an independent kingdom in Paraguay. He deals too much in generals, and makes too great a parade of his 'smiles' and his 'laughter' at the charge in question, to secure our confidence in his elaborate, but inefficient exculpation. It is certain, that the Jesuits had succeeded, by combining with a skilful adaptation an unremitting perseverance, in obtaining a complete ascendancy over a large population of the Guarany Indians, united in thirty towns within the limits of the Buenos Ayres jurisdiction. They had trained their converts to habits of implicit obedience, had accustomed them to military service, and reigned in the blind veneration of a people on whom they had conferred the benefits of a higher, though imperfect civilization. It is also certain, that, at a particular juncture, the Guaranies took up arms, and that troops were detached against them by the Spanish Governor. Respecting the details and the real causes of these events, there prevails, necessarily, much obscurity. The Jesuits are charged with the origination and protraction of these disturbances from selfish and ambitious motives. This is, of course, denied by Dobrizhoffer; but his denial requires the substantiation of a more impartial discussion than he has supplied. He affirms, and we are without the means of confronting his affirmation by documentary evidence, though we are far from yielding conviction to his modes of proof, that the loyalty of the Guaranies was devoted and unshaken; and though he confesses, what, indeed, it would have been mere audacity to deny, that they took up arms, he contends that it was only for the purpose of opposing the cession of their territory to the Portuguese. Whatever of truth, of falsehood, or of reservation, there may be in these statements, they are by no means adapted to set at rest this important question: it demands a less interested witness, and a much more distinct and specific investigation, before it can be considered as definitively settled.

The first of these volumes is occupied with a general description of the province of Paraguay, written in an amusing, but rambling style, and setting regular analysis at utter defiance. Tucuman, one of the divisions of this extensive territory, has Cordoba for its capital; a city distinguished for opulence and population.

'Lofty rocks rise in every part of the Cordoban district. A few leagues distant, on the banks of the river Pucara, which washes the city, is a place where lime is made. Coming to the place one night, when the sky was calm and the air tranquil, I heard terrible noises like the explosion of cannon. But the natives assured me that these sounds were common to the neighbouring rocks, and happened perpetually.

The air, confined in the cavities of the mountain, and attempting a forcible passage through the chinks, when stopped by opposing rocks, and reverberated by their windings, bellows after this fearful manner. In the city of Cordoba itself, a hollow murmur, resembling the knocks of a pestle in a wooden mortar, is frequently heard by night. This low mournful sound runs from one street to another, and is called by the Spaniards *el pison*, or the paving hammer.'

From a tree which grows in certain districts of this province, is prepared what is termed, 'the herb of Paraguay;' a leaf which, when dried, parched, and pulverised, is extensively used as a substitute for tea. It is conveyed on mules to the distant markets of Chili and Peru. Many thousands of labourers are employed in the different processes of this preparation; and, notwithstanding the necessity for caution in its use, on account of certain noxious qualities, it forms the habitual indulgence of the greater part of the population.

The great scourge of the Indian settlements of Paraguay was, the predatory and devastating warfare of the Mamalukes, or Brazilian half-castes; a fierce and reckless race, who made continual inroads on the native towns, and, beside carrying off every thing that was moveable, drove the inhabitants before them, handcuffed and bound to each other, into miserable and distant slavery. These disasters, added to the usual calamities consequent upon mutual quarrel and upon the neighbourhood of civilized colonies, will account for the state of wildness and destitution in which these poor savages generally exist. In the central regions of the immense tracts of Paraguay, dwell the Abipones, who appear to have migrated from the North, and still retain the tradition of their origin. They are a fierce and predatory nation who, obtaining by theft and violence horses from the Spanish settlements, adopted Tatar habits, became fearless and indefatigable equestrians, and harassed the European colonists with incessant and sanguinary warfare. These active and bold barbarians are well made and vigorous, capable of enduring all extremities, and sustaining, without exhaustion or complaint, incredible fatigues. Like all such races, they are excessively superstitious, claiming the devil for their ancestor, and revering the constellation of the Pleiades as his visible appearance. When those stars periodically disappear from the South American sky, the Abipones lament the sickness of their 'grandfather;' and when they reappear, his revival is celebrated with music and acclamations. Jugglers and pretenders to supernatural powers, are in high repute, and, on important occasions, practice, with uncouth ceremonies, the evocation of the dead.

' When these bugbears think any one inimical or injurious to them,

they will threaten to change themselves into a tiger, and tear every one of their hordesmen to pieces. No sooner do they begin to imitate the roaring of a tiger, than all the neighbours fly away in every direction. From a distance, however, they hear the feigned sounds. "Alas! his whole body is beginning to be covered with tiger spots!" cry they. "Look, his nails are growing," the fear-struck women exclaim, although they cannot see the rogue, who is concealed within his tent; but that distracted fear presents things to their eyes which have no real existence. It was scarce possible to persuade them out of their absurd terrors. "You daily kill tigers in the plain," said I, "without dread; why then should you weakly fear a false imaginary tiger in the town?" "You fathers don't understand these matters," they reply with a smile. "We never fear, but kill tigers in the plain, because we can see them. Artificial tigers we do fear, because they can neither be seen nor killed by us."

'In the month of January, a quantity of heavy rain fell in the night, and precipitating itself from a neighbouring hill, nearly overwhelmed the colony of St. Jeronymo. The immense force of waters broke the leathern door, rushed into my hut where I was sleeping, and not immediately gaining egress, increased to about five palms in depth. Awakened by the noise, I put my arms out of bed, and using them as a plumb, measured the depth of the water; and had not the wall which was perforated by the flood, opened a way to the waters, I must have been obliged to swim for my life. The same thing happened to all the Abipones who dwelt on low ground, their huts being entirely inundated. But lo! the next morning a report was spread, that a female juggler, who had received some offence from one of the inhabitants of the town, had caused this great storm in the intent of drowning the whole horde, but that the clouds had been repulsed, the rain stopped, and the town saved by the interposition of another juggler.'

The inhabitants of another village, parched with drought, and envious of the full measure enjoyed by their neighbours, ascribed the flood to a different agency, believing that the Jesuits had withheld their share, in order to punish them for their rejection of the spiritual authority claimed by those indefatigable Fathers.

The Abipones are divided into distinct hordes, each commanded by its own leader, without acknowledging any general authority, or committing the supreme direction to any single hand. They are not bound to their Cacique either by oaths of fidelity, or by pledges of allegiance; they acknowledge no law, and they seem to remain under his rule merely so long as their caprice or interest may dictate. When a report of near invasion spreads among them, great numbers are usually seized with a strong inclination to set out on a hunting expedition, which they contrive to protract until the danger has passed away. But when a predatory excursion is proposed, there is no difficulty in procuring volunteers. They are invited by their Cacique to a

public drinking party, where the mead goes round, until intoxication converts them into heroes, and they clamorously demand to be led against the enemy. Returning sobriety is said to make no change in their determination, the excitement first produced by drunkenness being kept alive by avarice, and they set forth cheerfully to plunder and destroy.

The manners of this race are described in such a rambling and gossiping manner by their present Historian, that it would neither be easy nor interesting to follow him, nor do they appear to exhibit any remarkable novelty. The women take the greater part of the laborious offices, and, in return, seem to be held in very light esteem by their husbands. It is related by Gumilla, that, among the tribes on the Orinoco, there is one which

‘marries old men to girls, and old women to youths, that age may correct the petulance of youth. For they say, to join young persons equal in youth and imprudence in wedlock together, is to join one fool to another. The marriage of young men with old women is a kind of apprenticeship, which after they have served for some months, they are permitted to marry women of their own age.’

The Abipon is permitted to have as many wives as he may please; but, instead of assembling them in one harem, and as a necessary consequence, encountering all the varieties of domestic disquiet, he generally establishes them in different hordes, and visits them at intervals. Divorce is frequent, and is so easily effected, as to have raised a doubt as to the real existence of any marriage bond whatsoever. They do not intermarry with relatives; and the fidelity of their females is rarely shaken. In diseases, they have recourse to the juggler; and, not unfrequently, under the apprehension that their disorder has been occasioned by one of that caste or by some still more innocent individual, pursue the life of their supposed enemy with vindictive ferocity.

Notwithstanding their characteristic cowardice, and their habitual avoidance of close quarters with a prepared enemy, the Abipones are formidable from their subtlety, celerity of movement, and barbarity. They are adepts in the management of ambuscades, and frequently attack their foes in the night, when, if discovered in time, they disappear in an instant. These modes of warfare proved extremely harassing to the Spaniards, who, unable to bring their assailants to regular action, were exhausted by the necessity for constant vigilance against an enemy who hovered around them in continual search for an unguarded point. In alliance with other fierce tribes, and no doubt exasperated by the outrages of the Europeans, the Abipones maintained an unremitting and devas-

tating strife against their invaders. Even when vigorous measures for the absolute extermination of one of the most ferocious nations, had so far succeeded as to expel it from its habitations and settlements, this energetic enterprise had only the effect of averting the storm from one frontier to impel it on another. Part of the Indian families submitted to the Spaniards, but the far greater number rushed, with aggravated hostility, on the South-western colonies.

‘ It is certainly difficult to understand by what means about a thousand savages, (for the whole nation of the Abipones hardly contained more who were able to bear arms,) had the power of disturbing an immense province. Unanimous hatred of the Spaniards, craft, tolerance of labour, and the alliance of the Macobios, stood them in the stead of numbers. Barreda, commander at St. Iago, repeatedly affirmed, that were he to hear that all the Abipones had been slain, ten only surviving, he should still judge it necessary to have the watch continued in every part of Paraguay. He therefore thought one tally of Abipones sufficient to distress a whole province. There was no retreat so sequestered that they did not discover, and furiously overrun; no place so remote or well fortified by nature, that they thought impenetrable. They swam across those vast rivers, the Parana and Paraguay, even where they are united in one channel, and pleasantly conversing at the same time. They rode over vast precipices, sometimes ascending, and sometimes, which was still more frightful, descending, till they reached the confines of Cordoba and St. Iago, and there, alas! what torrents of blood they caused to flow. Trackless woods full of rushes and thick trees, marshes, and lakes, rendered slippery with mud, they crossed with ease. That immense plain of a hundred and fifty leagues, which lies between the banks of the Parana and the Salado, is sometimes flooded to such a degree, that it resembles a vast lake; this happens after long and incessant rain; but when, as is often the case, no rain falls for many months, that immense tract of land is so parched by the burning sky, that the smallest bird would fail to find a drop of water there. The Abipones, regardless of these impediments, arrived at the dwellings of the Spaniards, whom they intended to kill or rob, by a journey of many days, sometimes having to pass through water, at others entirely destitute of it. I have frequently attempted the journey, both with Spaniards and Abipones, who have now laid aside their former enmity: the latter scorned to turn back, swearing that they might easily cross the deepest marshes on horseback, whilst the others declared them impassable. None of the Abipones would shrink from a journey of three hundred leagues or more, were they attracted by the hope of richer booty, or greater military glory.’

This description contains, in fact, the history of the Abipones in their relations with the Spaniards, if we take into account the insults, the treachery, the encroachments, and the sanguinary visitations which, though kept out of sight or

coloured over in the present work, were beyond all doubt sustained by the natives from the Europeans. A history is given, sufficiently interesting, though spun out to a rather insipid length, of the wars, both among each other and against the common enemy, which were engaged in by some of the most ferocious of the Indian nations. In these, Ychoalay is represented as the principal hero. Originally hostile to the Spaniards, he distinguished himself by his fearless, active, and skilful assaults, but with this singular quality in his warfare, that he never permitted (at least, we are so assured by Martin) any of his followers to take away 'the lives of men devoted to religion.' He subsequently became reconciled to the Colonists, and exhibited the same valour and conduct in their defence.

Harassed and exhausted by the indefatigable and destructive enmity of the Indians, the Spanish Governors employed the agency of missionaries for the purpose of allaying the existing feuds, and diffusing among the barbarians the blessings of religious instruction. These attempts are represented as feeble; and nothing but the persevering self-denial of the Jesuits could have struggled with the difficulties which surrounded them. They succeeded, however, to a considerable extent. Settlements were effected among the Macobios and the Abipones with much advantage, though the old propensities were occasionally too powerful for repression. Ychoalay was a much more effectual protector than the European authorities: always on the alert, he watched over the Fathers with unsleeping vigilance, snatching up his arms on the slightest alarm, and exploring the country in all directions. He was the chief of the Riikahés, a tribe engaged in almost constant hostilities with the Abipones, and after a series of spirited but indecisive conflicts, slew Debayakaikin, the Cacique of the latter.

'In the last fifty years which the Jesuits spent in Paraguay, 18,875 infants were sent to Heaven, having received baptism, and being devoid of reason, and consequently of sin. That you may not think this an exaggeration, I must tell you that, in the year 1732, those thirty Guarany towns situated near the Parana and Uruguay, contained 141,182 Christians. The repeated ravages of the measles and small-pox, military expeditions in the Royal Camps against the Portuguese, tumults of war on account of the Guarany Reductions, bloody incursions against the savages, and various diseases, had so diminished the number of inhabitants, that, on our return to Europe, we left scarce one hundred thousand Guaranies, though, twenty years before, the two colonies of Ytatines, St. Joachim, and St. Stanislaus, each containing almost five thousand inhabitants, had been added to the thirty ancient towns.'

Such, to these ill-fated savages, were the blessings of Euro-

pean connexion! Nor does it appear from anything that occurs in these volumes, that they were repaid for their sufferings by the communication of genuine religious instruction. They had tendered to them rites and ceremonies in abundance; deference to sacerdotal authority was sufficiently inculcated; but the simplicity of Divine truth, whatever Mr. Southey may think on the subject, was little likely to be taught by the 'injured' and notorious followers of St. Francis Xavier.

Art. VIII. *An easy Method of acquiring the Reading of Hebrew with the Vowel-points, according to the ancient Practice.* By an experienced Teacher. Price 1s. 6d. London, 1822.

THIS 'easy method' is comprised in a very neatly and distinctly printed table, including three lessons; the first containing the Alphabet, with the collateral addition of the Rabbinical and German Hebrew characters; the second, the vowel points, with a few useful rules; the third, a sort of praxis on the letters and points. A useful chart is thus provided for constant reference; but we regret that it has not been extended to the inclusion of the nominal and verbal paradigms. Some years ago, Israel Lyons compiled a very convenient short grammar of the Hebrew language, which is not now to be procured, and which we think that Mr. Borrenstein would have done well to republish.

Mr. B. has prepared expositions of the Syriac and Arabic alphabets on a similar plan; and they are stated to be in course of publication. We have felt some surprise at the non-adoption of this scheme in application to all the Eastern languages, comprehending the leading grammatical *formulae*. Few persons push their investigations of these dialects to any considerable advance; but a general acquaintance with their character is important in many respects; and this would be much facilitated by the aid of tabular arrangements.

Art. IX. *Two Letters on the Subject of the French Bible, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society: with a Postscript, containing Remarks on the concluding Observations of the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer, on the Whole Correspondence.* By the Rev. John Owen. A.M. One of the Secretaries of the B. & F. Society, &c. 8vo. Price 1s. London. 1822.

THIS last attack upon the British and Foreign Bible Society, while it shews that the *virus* of opposition has lost none of its malignity, is the most contemptible in kind, that has hitherto been made, and has proved to the assailant party the most signally mortifying in its issue. A Dr. Luscombe, who

distinguished himself some years ago by his opposition to the formation of the Hertford Auxiliary Bible Society, has charged the Committee of the Parent Society, with having sent forth to the world, a 'corrupted translation of the Bible.' This broad charge, when explained, amounts to this; that in one of the editions of the French Bible circulated by the Society, the language of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 19, is not rendered, as Dr. Luscombe thinks it ought to have been, "*Dieu étoit en Christ réconciliant le monde avec lui-même,*" but, "*Dieu a réconcilié le monde avec soi-même, par Christ;*" a rendering supported by high authorities. This is actually the substance of the charge, and silly enough it is. But the inquiry to which it has given rise, has brought out the fact, that the venerable and immaculate Society for promoting Christian Knowledge has actually been circulating *for ten or twelve years past*, a French Testament containing the most palpable corruptions of the text, in passages of the greatest doctrinal importance!! This fact was known to the Conductors of the Magazine in which the charge was vented; and was dishonestly concealed at the very time they were bringing an indictment against the Bible Society. And now it is discovered, the Editor has the impudence to confess that he knew it; but that he did not think there appeared any necessity for bringing it before the public *uncalled for!!* He moreover affirms, that the venerable Society did not publish the Socinianized version: *they only circulated it!* And 'for more than a fortnight after the appearance of the Editor's Letter in the New Times, copies were on sale as usual.'

Mr. Owen's Letters do the highest credit to his candour and Christian temper. In nothing has the Bible Society been more fortunate, than in the admirable qualifications of head and heart which distinguish its Secretaries, unless it be in the fatuity of its adversaries. This same Editor who has backed Dr. Luscombe in his attack, concludes his explanatory observations with suggesting one remedy for the *evils* inseparable from the system of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

'The evil,' he says, 'admits but of *one* remedy: *contract the sphere of the Society's operations*; sacrifice a little magnificence and a great deal of declamation to practical and permanent utility; publish a few correct translations; and those who disapprove of the Bible Society, will then be ready to admit that *some benefits may result from its operation.*'

Insolence and bigotry can go no further than this! Hitherto, no benefits, it seems, have resulted from the Bible Society's operations! But if they will but contract their issues of Bibles, suspend some of the Translations of the Scriptures which are going forward in almost every language under heaven,

copy the Bartlett's Buildings Committee in the venerable slowness of their movements, leave, like them, their Bookseller to choose the editions to be circulated, and lay out the surplus of their income in the purchase of stock and exchequer bills,—if, in a word, they will but consent to do less good, to raise less money, and give away fewer Bibles,—they whose highest wish on earth it is to see the Society on the decline, will, in consideration of such concession, bestow on the Committee the meed of their approbation.

Art. X. *A Dissertation on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: or a Refutation of the Hoadlyan Scheme of it.* By Henry Card, M.A. F.R.S. &c. Third Edition. 8vo. pp. xxx, 206. London, 1821.

THE former editions of this work, which never fell under our notice, bore the title of an Essay on the Eucharist, which is now abandoned for 'the more popular and comprehensible' one of a Dissertation on the Lord's Supper. It has for its object to maintain that view of the Eucharist, which was first insisted on and illustrated at large by Cudworth, and afterwards by Warburton; namely, that its true character is, 'a feast after a sacrifice.' St. Paul's reasonings, 1 Cor. x. 16, &c. are considered by these Writers as implying something more than an analogy; as asserting a close resemblance between the Lord's Supper and the feasts which, among heathens as well as Jews, followed after sacrifices. When this view of the rite is insisted upon for the purpose of excluding what enters not less essentially into its character, its design as a commemoration of the death of Christ, it becomes erroneous, since it is to substitute the figurative for the literal import. There can be otherwise no objection to the representation. It is one with which Protestant Dissenters are very familiar. Henry's Exposition speaks on this point the habitual language of their ministers. 'In short, the Lord's-supper is a feast on the sacrificed body and blood of our Lord: *epulum ex oblatis*. And to eat of the feast is to partake of the sacrifice, and so to be his guests to whom the sacrifice was offered; and this in token of friendship with him.* To all who believe in the doctrine of the Atonement, this idea is necessarily included in the rite, even when viewed as 'purely commemorative:' since what is commemorated is, the death of Christ as a sacrifice, as "the propitiation for our sins." What, indeed, was the passover but 'a rite purely commemorative?' What discrepancy, then, can

* Henry's Exposition, Vol. V. 1 Cor. x.

there be between the notion that the Lord's Supper is a memorial—in opposition to the Romish and semi-Romish notions, 'a bare memorial,'—and the belief that the event of which it is a memorial, was the offering of Christ as a sin-offering to take away our sins. This belief Zwingle undoubtedly held, and as undoubtedly he taught that the elements are bare signs or symbols of the body offered and the blood shed for us. Mr. Card has confounded together two things essentially different, the notions entertained by Zwingle and advocated by Hoadley as to the nature of the rite, and the Socinian view of the death of Christ. That there is no necessary connexion between what he terms the low notion of the rite, and low notions of the event it is designed to commemorate, he must himself admit; since, in charging upon the 'Anabaptists,' a violent attachment to Zwingle's views of the rite, he would not wish to be understood as falsely imputing to them a denial of the Atonement.

This indistinctness or confusion of ideas vitiates the whole of Mr. Card's reasonings on the subject. If it was his design to oppose the Socinian notion, (which, if we understand him right, is gaining ground 'among those who call themselves sincere members of the Establishment,') the direct method would have been, to point out the design and nature of our Lord's death, and the views of his sufferings which are essential to a due commemoration of them. This would have been, we beg leave to submit, much more adapted to 'turn the people to a better way of thinking,' than a revival of the Hoadleian controversy in all its disgraceful bitterness. It is, indeed, a most unhappy method of handling a practical subject, to mix it up with splenetic invectives against a prelate whose real offence was, his honestly deprecating the great scandal of his own Church, the prostitution of the Lord's Supper consequent on the Test-act. What were Bishop Hoadley's theological opinions on other points, we are not concerned to inquire.* They were probably far from orthodox. But, such as they were, he might have held them with perfect impunity, had he not avowed him-

* Mr. Card says. 'Bishop Hoadley, by stripping the Sacrament of all efficacious grace even to the worthy receiver, and thus destroying all idea of atonement, satisfaction, or propitiation, (since what are the benefits of these things, if Christ's death be not a real sacrifice?) has in effect proclaimed his disbelief of the Divinity of Christ.' This is either singularly weak arguing, or it is most unwarrantable assertion. As well might the Papist contend, that by rejecting the oblation of the host, Protestants in effect deny all idea of atonement or sacrifice. Between the Bishop's views of the sacrament, and a denial of the virtue of Christ's death as a real sacrifice, there is at least no necessary connexion.

self, in his political writings, what our Author is pleased to term 'of the lowest order of Whiggism.' But how pernicious must be the tendency of that ecclesiastical system which leads a clergyman like Mr. Card thus to mix up religious with political ideas, and to preface a dissertation on the Lord's Supper with an angry diatribe against the 'Republican Bishop and 'Whiggism.' Is a renunciation of Whig principles part of the 'preparation' he would enjoin on his parishioners previously to their partaking of the ordinance? Putting aside the bad taste and rancorous party feeling which are displayed in this strange association, where is the candour, the integrity of heaping all sorts of invective on the head of Bishop Hoadley for his 'bold and mischievous hypothesis' respecting the Eucharist as a bare memorial; while the Author is forced to admit, that the opinion numbers among its advocates, men 'of commanding powers and polemical acuteness,' whom it would be the 'height of injustice, of blind delusion,' to regard as otherwise than 'zealously affected to the best interests of the Church?' Why the Bishop of Bangor should be alone vilified for asserting an opinion held alike by Archbishops Herring and Tillotson and by Bishop Lowth, it remains for Mr. Card to explain.

We are far from altogether coinciding with Bishop Hoadley in his view of the Lord's Supper, but every sound Protestant must regard as far more dangerous the notions of those who were his most furious opponents; the abettors of a sacramental grace dispensed by a mediatorial priesthood. This notion is well known to have been maintained by Law, who went the length of declaring, that 'Christian priests are left us in Christ's 'stead to carry on his great design of saving us;' and in his Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, that 'when the bishop 'or priest intercedes for the congregation, and pronounces the 'Apostolic benedictions upon them, this is not barely an act 'of charity and humanity of one Christian praying for another, 'but is the work of a person commissioned by God to bless in 'his name, and be *effectually ministerial in the conveying of 'graces.*' It was because he exposed impious pretensions like these, that Hoadley was accused by that 'famous non-juror,' of 'exposing the validity of the sacraments, rallying on the 'uninterrupted succession of priests, and pulling down every 'pillar in the Church of Christ.' 'Why,' says Dr. Barrow, 'is the *opus operatum* in sacraments taught to confer grace, 'but to breed a high opinion of the priest and all that he 'doth?'

Mr. Card is far from going these lengths. We meet in his volume with none of these mad assumptions on behalf of the clergy, and he reasons sometimes piously and temperately.

'A man,' he says, 'may be saved without a sacrament, but can he be saved without a disposition to obey God's authority wherever he sees it? The command to Abraham to sacrifice his son was a positive order, and a very singular one, and apparently contradictory to some moral orders which had been given before; and yet the manner in which he exemplified his faith has placed him at the head of all the believing world. Our obedience then is always a reasonable service, whether we apprehend God's reasons for the injunction or not. His command is always reason enough for us, though it should not fall within our notions of right and fitness. But in truth, many of the reasons of his appointing sacramental signs and usages may be easily perceived in the obvious uses and ends of these institutions. For instance, what means could be more suited to promote our improvement in all the graces of the Christian life, than the Lord's Supper? What could tend more to establish our faith in the Gospel, than to partake of the memorials of the death of Christ, and see him as it were set forth crucified before our eyes; and call to remembrance, that, as certainly as we eat this bread and drink this cup, Jesus the Son of God suffered for our sins; and as certainly shall we participate in the everlasting benefit to be derived to our souls from this most mysterious and precious sacrifice?' pp. 164, 5.

But when our Author proceeds to affirm, that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the appointed *means whereby mankind are to be saved*, that the blessings of pardon and sanctification are peculiarly annexed to them, and are really conveyed by them; that, with the obliteration of our offences, this sacrament restores us to a power of receiving every communication of Divine grace necessary to our future and eternal salvation; we must pronounce his sentiments unscriptural and dangerous in the extreme. God's command is always reason good enough for our obedience, and his promise a sufficient warrant for our expectation. But where is the promise of a pardon and sanctification annexed to the partaking of the Lord's Supper? We do not complain of our Author's notions as involving a mystery, but as involving an untruth; not as contrary to reason, (though what is *really* contrary to reason cannot be true,) but as contrary to Scripture. "He that believeth on the Son of God," it is declared without any qualification, "shall be saved;" and again, "by grace are ye saved, through faith." To apply the striking metaphors by which our Lord taught the necessity of a vital faith in himself, to the rites which typified or symbolized the moral act, is to substitute the letter for the spirit, and to pervert Scripture in the worst style of the Romanists. If Mr. Card chooses to take his stand on the fathers or the formularies of his own Church, there he is welcome to remain. He himself admits that the language of the Church Catechism is most open to misinterpretation.

' It is not to be denied, much as it may be lamented, that some have taken a petulant, precipitate, and contentious exception to the terms *verily* and *indeed*, while those who wish to keep a more moderate tone, yet find themselves thrown into inextricable doubt and perplexity by these terms. Perhaps, in this instance, the compilers of the Catechism have been *unfortunate* in the choice of their expressions; since, from their strength, they are liable to misconception. "I am afraid," observes that original thinker, the late Abraham Tucker, "the expressions employed in the Catechism leave a notion in some people of *something divine* infused into the elements." p. 84.

There is no doubt that Tucker was right; and how should the people imagine otherwise, who are taught, that the blessings of pardon and sanctification are imparted to them as often as they go to church to take the sacrament? Mr. Card will have no difficulty in finding abundant authorities for such a notion—any where but in the Scriptures. But, at the expense of being set down as heretics, we must profess ourselves to be of Hoadley's opinion, that it is of 'small importance to Christians to know what the many writers upon this subject since the time of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed.' Mr. Card is very furious against this remark: 'the paradoxical inconsistency of the Bishop's language is here,' he says, 'so gross, as to become absolutely intolerable.' 'In spite,' he adds, 'of this presumptuous pride of didactic ignorance, I must venture to infer'—what? Why, that 'the Apostles and Evangelists, *though they did not affirm*, yet considered the last supper to be a feast on a sacrifice.' And if they did, what is this to the purpose, when the question respects the inherent efficacy of the rite as conveying the forgiveness of sins? Why, if Scripture can be made to yield any support to his argument, be so wroth with the Bishop for maintaining the fundamental article of Protestantism, that the Scriptures are the only and sufficient rule of faith? But in attempting to connect the supposition 'that this rite is a sacrificial feast, instituted in memory of Christ's death,' (a supposition in perfect unison with our own sentiments,) with the conclusion to which he abruptly jumps, that, therefore, 'it (the rite) really conveys, as the Church expresses it, *an inward and spiritual grace*, and all the benefits at which sacrifice aimed,' Mr. Card leaves Scripture and logic far behind him. It is impossible even to imagine by what impalpable link these two positions are associated in his own mind. He speaks indeed of a feast on a sacrifice being ordinarily the pledge or earnest of certain benefits; but what he means by 'ordinarily' in this reference, or what sort of benefits he intends, is to us quite enigmatical. We are still more at a loss to divine by what mode of proof he arrives at

the inference, that, if the ordinance amounts only to a commemoration of Christ's death, persons who lead unworthy lives 'may nevertheless, in that case, be worthy communicants!' From these most perplexing crudities we are glad to escape, and to shake hands again with the Author when we find him speaking, in the next page, like a Protestant and a Christian.

'Nothing can be more clear to the real Christian, than that without faith we must needs be unfit for that holy ordinance. The argument with him advances from conjecture to certainty, that it was intended for those alone for whom Christ's body was broken, and for the remission of whose sins Christ's blood was shed; and hence it was subjoined, let a man examine himself and so let him eat. Unless, therefore, we perform the exercises of the soul herein prescribed, it comes to us in word only, and not in power. They only can wash their garments and make them white in the blood of the Lamb; they only can spiritually receive and feed upon Christ's body and blood; they only can make the external rites which others perform, seals of the covenant, upon whom that great agent whose office it is to convince us of sin, has poured forth his aid and influence, because they have neither grieved, offended, nor done despite unto him—because they have sought and recognised God and his Christ, in their power and preciousness.' p. 151.

From a man who can write in this style, it is painful to differ. But why, with these just views, should he suffer himself to be misled by such writers as Law, and Skelton, and other theologues of that school, into the unintelligible doctrine of an *opus operatum* efficacy in the ordinance? Wherein is such a view as he has given above, at variance with the scriptural and practical admonition which he quotes with so much dissatisfaction from Dr. Bell?

'If ever,' says that dignitary, 'the bread and wine are received, whether by the well, the sick, or the dying, as an appointed means of obtaining the remission of sins, or in any other light than merely as an act of due obedience to a positive command of our Lord, *naturally* expressive of faith in him, and, when seriously performed, as *naturally* conducive to all such dispositions as that faith requires, the *participant* is *deceived*, and the rite itself is misapplied.'

By the term 'natural' here, it is obvious that Dr. Bell did not mean to exclude the idea of supernatural influences attending the observance of that or any other means of grace, to the soul of the devout worshipper; but he opposed it to the prevailing notion, that the Sacrament is to operate supernaturally on the mind as a charm,—to the pernicious and fatal delusion, that the present and immediate pardon of sin is annexed to its performance. Into this dangerous heresy, Mr. Card has fallen in common with the High-church and low Scripture theologians.

'As it is,' he says, 'the clear and undisputed language of the Gospel, that Christ came into the world to save sinners, it is surely not indulging too unlicensed and wild a fancy, to inculcate the *firm belief*, that the dying, as their state precludes them from the possibility of a relapse, may solace themselves with the hope of the Eucharist, conveying a full pardon and total acquittance from guilt. That there is no crime indeed in the opinion of the Church, which, on true repentance, will not be pardoned, is to be inferred from the well-known circumstance of her appointing a clergyman to attend the worst of malefactors that die by the hand of the executioner; and if he give signs of repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition at the thought of his past crimes, she so far relies on the acceptance of these, as to admit him to the Sacrament.'

We know she does, whether these signs of repentance appear or not; and this, in the slang of Newgate chaplains, is called '*making them up*' for execution. These poor deluded wretches are taught to receive the Sacrament as a *viaticum*. And yet, should a Dissenting teacher who would shrink from such a prostitution of the ordinance, after having paid the utmost attention to the case of some poor criminal, express his satisfaction with the repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition of which the offender gives signs, as marks of a saving conversion, the ministers of this same relying and confiding Church instantly set up the cry of *Fur Prædestinatus*.

But Mr. Card is too good a man not to have some misgivings on this point, which are betrayed in the perplexities of his phraseology. 'It is not, surely,' he says, 'a wild fancy' to inculcate a 'firm belief' of the lawfulness of a 'hope.' But is it not something worse than a wild fancy, to inculcate a *firm belief* in a delusion? The hope that is warranted by the promises of God, is no wild fancy, but a confidence in the Divine mercy which it is our duty to encourage in the penitent. But how can a firm belief relate to an unauthorized opinion as to what the dying man may believe? What is it that he is taught to believe? That, because there is no opportunity of his relapsing, and none, consequently, of his proving his sincerity, therefore, the reception of the Sacrament, on a general profession of repentance, *conveys* to him 'a full pardon and total acquittance of guilt.' What is this, but the Romish doctrine of priestly absolution in the most insidious form? 'It is impossible,' says Calvin, speaking of the party who 'attribute to the Sacraments I know not what latent virtues, *which are no where represented as communicated to them by the word of God*,' by maintaining that they 'justify and confer grace, provided we do not obstruct their operation by any mortal sin,'—'it is impossible to express the pestilence and fatal nature of this opinion; and especially as it has prevailed over a large

‘ part of the world, to the great detriment of the Church, for
 ‘ many ages past. Indeed, it is evidently diabolical; for, by
 ‘ promising justification without faith, it precipitates souls into
 ‘ destruction. In the next place, by representing the Sacra-
 ‘ ments as the cause of justification, it envelops the minds of
 ‘ men, naturally too much inclined to the earth, in gross super-
 ‘ stition, leading them to rest in the exhibition of a corporeal
 ‘ object, rather than in God himself.* And when the lan-
 guage and practice of the Church in this respect are taken in
 connexion with the Absolution in the office for the Visitation
 of the Sick, how can any doubt be entertained as to the ten-
 dency of this pernicious doctrine? From such a notion, the
 scriptural views of the ordinance entertained by such men as
 Halyburton and Erskine, and Doddridge, whom Mr. Card
 quotes with a becoming respect creditable to his candour,
 differ as widely as light from darkness. The twofold abuse of
 the Eucharist as a ‘ picklock to a place,’ and a forged pass-
 port to heaven, is the great scandal of the Church, an offence
 which smells most foully, and, in its demoralizing influence on
 the population, a source of incalculable mischief. He is the
 truest friend of that Church, who is doing his utmost to obtain,
 if possible, a reform, in this respect, in her doctrine and dis-
 cipline. Such an attempt was made in 1661. Its issue is but
 too well known. When it was proposed by the Presbyterian
 ministers, that the administration of the Sacrament to the
 sick, should be left to the discretion of the minister, the
 Court party gave for answer: ‘ It is not fit the minister
 ‘ should have the power to deny *this viaticum* or Holy Com-
 ‘ munion to any that humbly desire it, according to the
 ‘ Rubric, which no man disturbed in his wits can do, and
 ‘ *whosoever does*, must in charity be presumed to be peni-
 ‘ tent and fit to receive.’ We cannot do better than give, in
 conclusion, the reply of the petitioning party,

‘ There is *no* condition mentioned in the Rubric, but that he “ be de-
 sirsous of receiving the communion in his own house:” *humbly* is not
 there. And why may not a man disturbed in his wits, desire the com-
 munion? You deny things that ordinarily fall out, and yet lay the
 weight of your cause on that denial. But why must we give the sacra-
 ment to those that have lived in gross ignorance, infidelity, and profane-
 ness, and never manifested credibly that they repent? You say that
 “ *whosoever desireth the Sacrament according to the Rubric, must in
 charity be presumed to be penitent.*” But where hath God commanded
 or approved so blind and dangerous an act as this, under the name of

* Institutes, Book IV. C. xiv. § 14.

charity? The ordinary observation of our lives is not to be confuted by men's assertions. We know by sad experience, that there is abundance of the worst men among us, that are desirous to receive this sacrament when they are sick, that give no credible evidence of true repentance; but some in the ignorance and deceit of their hearts, and some as conscious of their impiety, for which they seek any shifting remedy to quiet their consciences for the time, are much more eager for this sacrament in their sickness, than many better and more penitent persons. And must we judge all these penitents, and give them the sacrament as such? We must needs profess that we think this course would be not the least effectual service unto Satan, to deceive poor sinners, and keep them from knowing their misery, and seeking aright after the true Remedy in time.

Pardon us while we lay together the parts of your doctrine, as we understand it here delivered. 1. All infants of any parents in the world that we can baptize, are undoubtedly regenerate and in a state of life, and shall be saved if they so die. 2. The Holy Ghost and forgiveness of sin being then given them, it is charitably presumed, that they have not totally lost this, notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood, and so, when they can say the catechism, they are to be confirmed. 3. Being confirmed, they are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper. 4. All that marry, and others thrice a year, must receive the Lord's Supper, though unfit. 5. The minister must absolve all the sick that say they repent—if we understand you, for we suppose you allow not the minister to be the judge. 6. This Absolution must be absolutely expressed—"I absolve thee from all thy sins"—without the condition, "If thou repent and believe." 7. Whosoever desireth the Communion in his sickness, must, in charity, be presumed to be penitent, and receive. 8. The minister must not have power to forbear such baptizing, absolving, or delivering the Communion as aforesaid. We now omit what is said of the Dead at burial. And if this be not the ready way to hinder thousands from the necessary knowledge of their unrenewed hearts and lives, and from true repentance, and from valuing Christ as the Remedy, and from making a necessary preparation for death, and also the way to lay by abundance of faithful conscionable ministers that dare not take such a deceiving dangerous course, we must confess ourselves much mistaken in the nature of man's corruption and misery, and the use of God's ordinances for his recovery.*

Art. XI. *The Protestant Reformation vindicated*. A Sermon delivered at Lune-street Chapel, Preston. By Joseph Fletcher, M. A. 8vo. pp. 36. Blackburn. 1822.

THIS able discourse is one of a series delivered at a public lecture recently established in the town of Preston, by the neighbouring Dissenting ministers. Several of these have been

* "History of Nonconformity, as it was argued and stated by Commissioners on both Sides, in 1661." pp. 320-2.

published; and a considerable interest has been excited in the Roman Catholic controversy in that district, to which an attack on the Bible Society by the Rev. J. Curr, a Roman Catholic priest, has not a little contributed. The present publication is the only one which has reached us. The points which Mr. Fletcher has selected for discussion, are, the causes which immediately produced the Reformation, and the great principles which were developed and established in the course of their operation. On these principles, which are, substantially the principles of Nonconformity, the vindication of the great Protestant secession from the Church of Rome can alone be maintained: and the Dissenter therefore, has an immense advantage in conducting this controversy. The sermon may be considered as a sort of appendix to the Author's valuable "Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion;" and to the purchasers of that volume its publication will be highly acceptable. We have no doubt that it must have had a powerful effect in the delivery.

Foremost among the moral causes which produced the Reformation, the Preacher places the faithful preaching of the Gospel, in connexion with which occur the following excellent remarks.

"It was especially the preaching of salvation by the free sovereign grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ, the doctrine of justification by faith, which produced such mighty results in the state of the world. This according to Luther was the "article of a standing or falling church." This truth in all the principles it implies and secures, while it humbles the pride of man, and lays him in the dust of self abasement before God, at the same time most effectually secures all the interests of genuine holiness.

"And you will ask, how did the *revived* exhibition of the peculiar doctrines of the Cross aid and advance the cause of the Reformation? Because the promulgation of these doctrines is God's appointed instrument for the conversion and renovation of mankind—because wherever these truths have free course and are glorified, all the practical consequences of a pure and undefiled religion will follow—because, without these, whatever temporary ascendancy a new or another system might have secured over the principles of the Papal Church, there would have been no permanent result worthy of the struggle and the contest in which so many thousands sealed their testimony with their blood!—Because whatever system of principles and institutions be supported, whatever names those principles may bear, in whatever communion of nominal Christianity they may be exhibited, whether established or non-established by human authority, no spiritual good will be effected if they are either omitted or denied; no conversion of sinners to God; no genuine, vital, practical, experimental religion! These are the truths which God "delights to honour"—by which the fishermen of Galilee overturned the altars of Heathenism, expelled demons from their usurped

dominion, struck dumb their lying oracles, and raised the standard of the Cross over the ruins of ignorance, barbarism, and superstition in the first ages of the world. And whence arose this mighty triumph? Not by secular policy and worldly pomp, persecuting laws and measures of violence; but by the force of these doctrines, the evidence by which they were established, the purity with which they were adorned, and the faithful, persuasive, and earnest declaration of the truth, as it is in Jesus! These were the weapons of their holy war; by these, under God, they "cast down strong holds and dethroned high imaginations." By similar methods, all the *spiritual* good of the Reformation was effected; and whenever Protestants of any order forget the great peculiarities of Evangelical truth; whenever they confine their attention to principles that have no vital connexion with the *life-inspiring* doctrines of the Cross, whatever may be their professions or their creeds, they will become the mere residuum of a worldly system. They may contend for the outward defences and external observances of Christianity, but the indwelling spirit will retire from their temples, and on their walls will be inscribed in legible characters—*The glory is departed!* Institutions are for the sake of principles, and principles are worth nothing, only so far as they coincide with the great ends for which the entire system of Christianity was founded; *the conversion of sinners from the error of their ways, and the building up of the faithful in knowledge and holiness unto life eternal?* pp. 19, 21.

A strange typographical impropriety has caught our eye in the following paragraph: 'As if the being worshipped had a 'special liking,' &c. At first sight, the word 'being' would be mistaken for a participle. We are not very partial to the form of expression, which borders on irreverence; but when any lower phrase is employed metonymically for the Divine name, it is indispensable that it should be distinguished by an initial capital. In the present instance, it is, we are persuaded, a mere oversight, which we shall be happy to find that the Author has had an opportunity of rectifying in a new edition.

ART. XII. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

- • *Gentlemen and Publishers who have works in the Press, will oblige the Conductors of the ECLECTIC REVIEW, by sending information (post paid) of the subject, extent, and probable price of such works; which they may depend upon being communicated to the public, if consistent with its plan.*

Preparing for publication, the Life and Times of Daniel de Foe, with a copious account of his writings, and anecdotes of several of his Contemporaries. By Walter Wilson.

In the press, Soame Jenyns's Disquisitions on various subjects. To be printed in royal 16mo, uniform with the reprints of Warwick's "Spare Minutes," and Quarles's "Enchiridion," with a portrait of the Author from an original by Sir Joshua Reynolds.

In the press, the Village Lecturer, a series of Sermons adapted to village and family reading.

Mr. Valpy is reprinting his edition of Brotier's Tacitus in 4 vols. 8vo. It combines the advantages of the Paris and Edinburgh editions, with a selection of Notes from all the Commentators on Tacitus, subsequent to the Edinburgh edition; the Literaria Notitia and Politica, with all the Supplements, are also added; the French passages are translated, and the Roman Money turned into English.

Shortly will be published, in 2 vols. 8vo. with plates of the Egyptian Deities, sections and plans of the Egyptian Temples and Tombs, ichnographical plans of Thebes, Jerusalem, and the environs, &c. &c. Travels along the Mediterranean, and parts adjacent, extending as far as the second Cataract of the Nile, Jerusalem, Damascus, Balbec, Constantinople, Athens, Joannina, the Ionian Isles, &c. &c. in the years 1816, 17, and 18, in company with the Earl of Belmore. By Robert Richardson, M. D. Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians in London.

Speedily will be published, Letters from Mecklenburg and Holstein, including an Account of the Cities of Hamburg and Lubeck. By Mr. George Downes, of Trinity College, Dublin.

A Magazine in the French Language will be published in London, on the 1st of June, under the title of *Le Musée des Variétés Littéraires*. To be continued monthly, price 1s. 6d.

Sir Gilbert Blane has in the press, in 1 vol. 8vo. *Select Dissertations on various Medical Subjects*.

Shortly will be published, in one vol. 8vo. a Treatise on the Nature and Principles of Inflammation and Fever, with practical observations on the principal remedies for Inflammation. By C. E. Lucas, M. D.

In the press, *Journal of a Tour from Astrachan to the Scotch Colony at Kars on the Russian Lines north of the Mountains of Caucasus*. Containing occasional remarks on the manners of the inhabitants, &c. &c. with the substance of many conversations with Effendis, Mollas, and other Mahomedans on the questions at issue between them and Christians regarding the way of salvation. By the Rev. William Glen, Missionary and Minister of the Scotch Church, Astrachan.

In the press, a short Character of Charles II. King of England; written by John (Sheffield) Duke of Buckingham, Lord President of her late Majesty's Privy Council. With the conference between (George Villiers) the Duke of Buckingham and Father Fitzgerald, an Irish Jesuit, sent by King James II. to convert his then Grace in his sickness to the Romish religion. Faithfully taken by his Grace's Secretary. With an elegant portrait of Charles. It will be printed in a very superior style, on fine thick hot-pressed paper.

In the press, *Essays, Philological, Critical, and Miscellaneous*. By Dr. Samuel Johnson. In one handsome cabinet volume. Including the various Essays and Disquisitions connected with the English Dictionary, reviews of books, at their first appearance, by Dr. Johnson; and numerous essays on various subjects of distinguished excellence, both for the thought and expression, which are apt to be overlooked in works so voluminous as this author's. Corresponding with Johnson's Letters and Essays, lately published.

A work by the Author of *Select Pe-*

male Biography, designed to illustrate the beauty, order, and utility of the vegetable world, is now in the press. It is entitled, the Wonders of the Vegetable Kingdom displayed, and contains a variety of elegant and scientific information relative to the economy of plants.

The Life and Correspondence of Bishop Horsley, is preparing for publication, by his Son, in an octavo volume.

Dr. A. Tilloch is preparing for the press, Dissertations introductory to the study of the language, structure, and contents of the Apocalypse.

G. W. Manby is printing a Journal of a Voyage to Greenland in the Baffin of Liverpool, commanded by W. Scoresby, jun., in 1821.

The Rev. B. Andrews of Trowbridge is preparing for publication a work, to be entitled, Clavis Græca Biblica, containing a short introduction to the Greek Tongue, and a copious Greek Lexicon for the Septuagint, New Testament, and Apocrypha; with the signification of the words given in Latin and English: designed for theological Students who have not had the benefit of a classical education, and such persons as know the English language only, but desire to understand the Greek Scriptures. By the help of this work, without a Teacher, they may speedily and with but little application make themselves acquainted with them.

Nearly ready for publication, Letters and Conversations on Public Preaching, including rules for the preparation of sermons, in which the principles of the celebrated Claude are adopted and extended in numerous examples from the best authors.

In the press, the Essay on "The influence of a moral life on the judgement in matters of faith," to which the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and Church Union in the diocese of St. David's adjudged its premium for 1821. By the Rev. Samuel Charles Wilks, author of "Christian Essays;" "Signs of Conversion and Unconversion in Ministers;" "Claims and Duties of the Church," &c.

The Rev. J. W. Bellamy is preparing for publication, by subscription, a selection of the Poems of the Rev. Thomas Cherry, B. D. late Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, with a very fine portrait.

William Spence Esq. is republishing his Tracts on Political Economy, viz.

1. Britain independent of Commerce; 2. Agriculture the source of the Wealth of Britain; 3. The objections against the Corn Bill refuted; 4. Speech on the East India Trade; with Prefatory Remarks on the causes and cure of our present distresses as originating from the neglect of principles laid down in these works.

In the press, Sermons on a variety of interesting and important subjects. By the late Rev. Noah Hill, of Old Gravel Lane. With his funeral sermon, including a brief memoir. By his Successor, Rev. J. Hooper, A. M. 1 vol. 8vo.

Mr. Jehoshaphat Aspin is preparing for the press, the Third Volume of his Analysis of Universal History; which is expected to appear in the course of the ensuing autumn.

Speedily will be published, Revolutionary Causes; with a brief notice of some late publications; and a postscript containing Strictures on "Cain," &c.

In the press, an Itinerary of Provence and the Rhone; with etchings. By John Hughes, Esq. A. M. of Oriel College, Oxford.

In the press, Belshazzar, a dramatic poem. By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 8vo.

In the press, Bracebridge Hall; or the Humourists. By the Author of the Sketch Book. 2 vols. 8vo.

The Hon. and Rev. William Herbert has in the press, The Guahiba, a Tale.

In the press, Switzerland; or a Journal of a Tour and Residence in that Country. Followed by a general view of its history, brought down to the present time, and principally directed to the manner and mode of life of the people in ancient and modern times. By S. Simond, Author of the Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain. 2 vols. 8vo.

Speedily will be published, Vestiges of Ancient Manners and Customs, discoverable in modern Italy and Sicily. By the Rev. John James Blunt, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and late one of the Travelling Bachelors of that University.

Miss Porden, Author of the Veils, has in the press, Cœur de Lion, or the Third Crusade, a poem, in sixteen books.

Mr. Nichols is preparing the fourth volume of Illustrations of Literary History, which will conclude the eighteenth century.

The Rev. Wm. Basset is printing, in two duodecimo volumes, *Sermons on the Book of Genesis*, tending to shew that there is indeed but one religion in the two Testaments.

Ant. Aufrere, Esq. has nearly ready for publication, a translation of Dr. Della Cella's *Journey from Tripoli to the frontiers of Egypt*, illustrated by a map.

Mr. James Elmes, architect, will soon

publish, in a quarto volume, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Sir Christopher Wren*.

Mr. James Holman has in the press, the *Narrative of a Journey in 1819-20-21, through France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands*.

Mr. W. H. Ireland will soon publish, in two octavo volumes, a *Poetical Translation of Voltaire's Maid of Orleans*, with copious notes.

Art. XIII. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs and Select Remains of an only Son. By the Rev. T. Durant. 2 vols. 10s. 6d.

William Lilly's Memoirs of his Life and Times: with 12 portraits of eminent astrologers, &c. 8vo. 12s. 6d. large paper, 1l. 1s.

The Life of the Rev. J. W. Fletcher, late Vicar of Madeley, Shropshire. By the Rev. Robert Cox, A. M. Perpetual Curate of St. Leonard's, Bridgenorth. 5s.

Memoirs of the late Miss Mary Ann Burton, of Kentish town. 12mo. 6s.

HISTORY.

Reminiscences. By Charles Butler, Esq. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Sketches of the Character, Manners, and present State of the Highlanders of Scotland: with details of the Military Service of the Highland Regiments. By Colonel David Stewart. Illustrated by a map of the Highlands, denoting the districts or countries inhabited by the Highland Clans. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 8s.

ICHTHYOLOGY.

An Account of the Fishes found in the river Ganges and its branches. By F. Hamilton (formerly Buchanan) M. D. F. R. S. L. & E. 4to. with a volume of 39 plates, containing 97 engravings of fishes, in royal 4to. 5l. 5s.

MEDICINE.

Essays Physiological and Practical. By James Carson, M. D. Physician in Liverpool. 8vo. 3s.

The Way to preserve Health and attain Longevity, with a familiar treatise on domestic medicine: pointing out the diseases of men, women, and children, in all climates, with prescriptions in English. By Robert Thomas, M. D. &c. 8vo. 15s.

MINERALOGY.

Conversations on Mineralogy; with plates, engraved by Mr. and Miss Lowry from original drawings, comprising upward of 400 figures of minerals, including 12 beautifully coloured specimens. 2 vols. 12mo. 14s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Elements of Thought, adapted to the use of schools; and especially designed to aid the studies of young persons who wish to supply the defects of a common education. By Isaac Taylor, jun. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Tales and Dialogues in prose and verse. By Jafferys Taylor, Author of *Esop in Rhyme*, &c. With six engravings. 3s.

An Inaugural Lecture delivered at the Common Hall of the University of Glasgow. By D. K. Sandford, Esq., A. B. Oxon. Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Essays on Intellectual and Moral Improvement, and the Social Virtues: principally designed for youth. By J. Flockart, 3s. 6d.

The Miscellaneous Tracts of the late William Withering, M. D. F. R. S. Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Lisbon, Author of the *Botanical Arrangement of British Plants*, &c. &c. To which is prefixed a *Memoir of his Life, Character, and Writings*, by W. Withering, Esq. F. L. S. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 7s.

The Rules and Orders of the Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors, and regulations of the Office; also a list of the Officers; the London and Country Attorneys, with the agents of the latter, corrected to the present time; a table of the fees, &c. &c. and an Appendix containing a new and most useful Summary of the Insolvent Debtor's Act, (1. Geo. 4. c. 119.) with copious marginal notes,

occasional notes of cases, and an index. 8vo. 3s.

An additional volume of the *Elegant Extracts in Prose*; containing esteemed ancient and modern Literature. By W. Ryan. 11. 1s.

Memoirs of the Astronomical Society of London. Vol. I. 4to. 11. 1s.

The Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan. 8vo. 12s.

Evenings in Autumn: a series of Essays, Narrative and Miscellaneous. By Nathan Drake, M. D. Author of *Literary Hours*, &c. 2 vols. post 8vo. 11. 1s.

A few days in Athens: being the Translation of a Greek MS. discovered in Herculaneum. By Frances Wright. Author of *Views of Society and Manners in America*. post 8vo. 6s.

The Works of John Home, Esq. Author of *Douglas*, a Tragedy, now first collected; with an account of his Life and Writings. By Henry Mackenzie, Esq. F. R. S. E. 3 vols. 8vo. 11. 11s. 6d.

These volumes contain *Douglas*, a tragedy, and the other dramatic pieces of the author; the History of the Rebellion in Scotland, in the year 1745: in the appendix to the Life will be found Letters from the Marquis of Bute, David Hume, James M'Pherson, Dr. Adam Ferguson, Dr. Carlyle, and other eminent literati of the last age.

* * * An Edition of the Life of Mr. Home is printed for separate sale. 8vo. 7s.

POETRY.

Sir Marmaduke Maxwell, a dramatic Poem; the *Mermaid of Galloway*; the *Legend of Richard Faulder*; and twenty *Scottish Songs*: By Allan Cunningham. fcap. 8vo. 7s.

The School Shakspeare; or, *Plays and Scenes from Shakspeare*. Illustrated for the use of schools, with glossarial notes, selected from the best annotations. By the Rev. J. R. Pitman, A. M. Alternate Evening Preacher at the Foundling and Magdalen Hospitals. 8vo. 18s.

Ecclesiastical Sketches, in verse. Part I. from the Introduction of Christianity into Britain, to the Consummation of the Papal Dominion. Part II. To the close of the Troubles in the Reign of Charles I. Part III. From the Restoration to the present Times. By W. Wordsworth, Esq. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Memorials of a Tour on the Continent

in 1820. By William Wordsworth, Esq. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Uriel; a poetical Address to Lord Byron; with notes containing strictures on the spirit of infidelity maintained in his works: with other poems.

Catiline, a Tragedy, in five acts; with other Poems. By the Rev. George Croly, A.M. Author of *Paris in 1815*, *Angel of the World*, &c. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

POLITICAL.

An Examination of the Plan laid before the Cortes of Spain for the recognition of South American Independence. By the Abbé de Pradt. 3s.

A Letter to the Right Hon. Rob. Peel, M.P. &c. upon the subject of Bank-note forgery. Clearly demonstrating that a Bank-note may be produced more difficult to be imitated than even the metallic currency. By John Robertson. 1s.

An Apology for the Freedom of the Press. By Robert Hall, A.M. Sixth edition. 3s. 6d.

Thoughts on the Poor Laws, with a Plan for reducing the poor's rates, preparatory to their abolition. By S. Brookes. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Reply to Mr. Hale's "Appeal to the public in defence of the Spitalfields Act." By the Author of "*Observations on the Ruinous Tendency of the Spitalfields Act.*" 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THEOLOGY.

Lectures on the Reciprocal Obligations of Life; or a practical Exposition of domestic, ecclesiastical, patriotic, and mercantile duties. By John Morison, Minister of Trevor Chapel, Brompton. 12mo. 7s.

Considerations on the subject of Calvinism; and a short Treatise on Regeneration; designed for the use of such as feel interested in the Inquiry, whether Calvinism be or be not the doctrine of the Bible and the Church of England. By William Bruce Knight, A.M. Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff. Copy 8vo. 6s.

Sermons, chiefly delivered in the chapel of the East India College, Hertfordshire. By the Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, A.M. Professor of Mathematics at the East India College, and late fellow of Trin. Coll. Cambridge. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Imitation of Christ, in three

Books. By Thomas à Kempis. Translated from the Latin, by John Payne. With a Recommendatory Preface, by Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Minister of St. John's Church, Glasgow.

The History of the Destruction of Jerusalem; as connected with the Scriptural Prophecies. By the Rev. George Wilkins, A.M. Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Kinnoull, Vicar of St. Mary in the Town, and of Lawdham in the County of Nottingham. 3d edition, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Treatise on the Sabbath; or, Illustrations of the nature, obligations, change, proper observance, and spiritual advantage of that holy day. By the Rev. John Glen, Minister of the Chapel in Portobello. 12mo. 5s.

A Catechism on the first principles of the Holy Scriptures, designed for young people. By David Russell, Minister of the Gospel, Dundee. 6d.

Roses from the Garden of Sharon, being a collection of Scripture texts for every day in the year. 8d. or 7s. per doz.

The Works of the Rev. W. Paley, D.D. Archdeacon of Carlisle (being one of the Edinburgh Classics); containing **Natural Theology—Evidences of Christianity—Horæ Paulinæ and Tracts—and the Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy.** With a life and portrait. 4 vols. 24mo. 18s.

Institutions of Theology; or, a concise System of Divinity. With reference under each article to some of the principal authors who have treated of the subjects particularly and fully. By Alexander Ranken, D.D. one of the Ministers of Glasgow. 8vo. 14s.

Unitarianism a Perversion of the Gos-

pel of Christ, a Sermon. By the Rev. A Bishop. 9d.

The Young Communicant's Remembrancer, a Treatise, intended at once to remind the Young Communicant of the practical obligations of religion; and to direct and encourage him amidst the duties and difficulties of the Christian Life. By the Rev. William Hamilton, Minister of Strathblane. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

TRAVELS AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Travels in Syria and Mount Sinai. viz. 1. A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus—2. A Tour in the District of Mount Libanus and Antilibanus—3. A Tour in the Hauran—4. A Second Tour in the Hauran—5. A Journey from Damascus, through Arabia Petrea and the Desert El Ty, to Cairo—6. A Tour in the Peninsula of Mount Sinai. By the late John Lewis Burckhardt. With a Map, 4to. 2l. 8s.

The Travels of Theodore Ducas, in various countries of Europe, at the Revival of Letters and Art. Part the First—Italy. Edited by Charles Mills, Esq. Author of the History of the Crusades, and a History of Mahomedanism. 2 Vol. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

A Journey from Merut, in India, to London, through Arabia, Persia, Armenia, Georgia, Russia, Austria, Switzerland, and France, during the Years 1819 and 1820. With a Map and Itinerary of the Route. By Lieut. Thomas Lumsden, of the Royal Horse Artillery. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Dissertation on the Topography of the Plain of Troy; including an Examination of the Opinions of Demetrius, Chevalier, Dr. Clarke, and Major Rennell. By Charles Maclaren. 8vo. 9s.